Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-113
Tuesday
12 June 1990

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-113 *12 June 1990*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

U.S.-USSR Disarmament Agreements Viewed *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 23]* 1
U.S. Negotiator Says Summit Opened Way for Cuts *[TASS]* 2

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

'Last Meeting of Superpowers' Discussed *[MOSCOW NEWS No 21]* 3
Foreign Policy Initiatives Termed 'Untimely' *[TASS]* 3
Foreign Ministry Official Views Emigration Law *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 23]* 4
State Bank Chief Views New European Bank *[IZVESTIYA 8 Jun]* 6
UN Committee on Peaceful Use of Space Meets 7
Space Inspectorate Suggested *[TASS]* 7
'Consensus' on Principles Reached *[TASS]* 7
European Police Chiefs Attend Meeting *[PRAVDA 11 Jun]* 7
Allies Could Share East Berlin War Museum *[PRAVDA 8 Jun]* 8

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Reportage, Commentary on Gorbachev Visit 9
Gorbachev Hails Outcome *[TASS]* 9
Gorbachev on Arms Agreements *[TASS]* 9
Reagan Cited on Gorbachev *[TASS]* 9
Americans Take Positive View *[TASS]* 9
Commentary Notes Improving Relations *[Moscow Radio]* 10
Comparison of San Francisco Speech 10
Comparison of Comments After Camp David 11
Soviet-U.S. UN Association Talks End *[TASS]* 11
Nikitin-Led Delegation Ends U.S. Visit *[TASS]* 12
Parliamentary Delegation Continues Canada Visit 12
Meet Committee Members *[TASS]* 12
Meets Governor General *[TASS]* 13
Return From Canada *[IZVESTIYA 10 Jun]* 13
Canadian Firm Signs Agreement on Packaging Plant *[IZVESTIYA 5 Jun]* 13

China

Liu Huaqing Continues Official Moscow Visit 14
Visits Space Flight Center *[Moscow International]* 14
Meets With Zaykov *[TASS]* 14
Tiananmen Anniversary Marked by Uneasy Calm 14
No 'Bloodshed' Planned *[TRUD 5 Jun]* 14
Conditions Unripe for Democracy *[IZVESTIYA 5 Jun]* 15
USSR, PRC Examine Asian-Pacific Ocean *[Moscow Radio]* 16

Near East & South Asia

Soviet-U.S. Summit Seeks Afghan Settlement *[TASS]* 16
Afghan Border Situation Continues To Deteriorate *[Moscow International]* 16

MiG-21 Crashes Into Kabul Building 10 Jun *[TASS]* 17
Lebanese Leader on Baghdad, U.S.-Soviet Summits *[Moscow TV]* 17
Jibril Warns of Plans To Attack Soviet Jews *[TASS]* 18

East Europe

Gorbachev Greets Hungary's Horn on Party Post *[TASS]* 18
Aboimov Comments on Pact, Ties With Hungary *[Budapest MTI]* 18
MSZMP Secretary Visits International Department *[PRAVDA 9 Jun]* 18

West Europe

FRG's Genscher Calls for More Trust in Europe *[TASS]* 18
Interviewed on Reunification *[PRAVDA 8 Jun]* 19
Correspondents Review Importance of Brest Talks *[TASS]* 21
Shevardnadze, Genscher Begin Talks in Brest 21
TASS Details Talks 21
Genscher Issues Statement *[IZVESTIYA 12 Jun]* 22
Ligachev, Swedish Envoy Discuss Market Economy *[TASS]* 22
Ligachev Leaves for Visit to Stockholm 5 Jun *[TASS]* 22
Agricultural Cooperation Discussed *[TASS]* 22
Cooperative Movement Studied *[Moscow TV]* 23
Summit, Market Economy Reviewed *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 10 Jun]* 24
More on British Prime Minister's Visit 25
Thatcher on European Cooperation *[Moscow TV]* 25
Concludes Visit 10 Jun *[TASS]* 26

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet Session

Supreme Soviet Deputies Interviewed on Work *[Moscow TV]* 27
Supreme Soviet Commissions, Committees Meet *[Moscow Radio]* 27
Gorbachev To Address Supreme Soviet 12 Jun *[Moscow Radio]* 27

Political & Social

Russian Parliament Declares Republic Sovereign *[AFP]* 28
No Balts, Other Nationalities at Peasant Congress *[Moscow TV]* 28
Gorbachev, Ryzhkov Address CPSU Conference *[TASS]* 28
Congress Preparatory Group Discusses Program 28
8 Jun Meeting Viewed *[PRAVDA 9 Jun]* 28
More on Program Meeting *[PRAVDA 11 Jun]* 29
Two-Part 28th CPSU Congress Advocated *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 2 Jun]* 36
Decree Implementing USSR Citizenship Law *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 1 Jun]* 38
Law on USSR Citizenship Published *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 1 Jun]* 38
Supreme Soviet Resolution on Draft Law Viewed *[PRAVDA 4 Jun]* 44
May Day Red Square Disturbances Viewed *[MOSCOW NEWS No 19]* 45
CPSU Democratic Platform Holds Conference *[Moscow TV]* 46
Labor Protection Association Formed *[Moscow Radio]* 46
Farmers Union Founding Congress Opens *[TASS]* 46
Medvedev, Others Visit Victory Exhibition *[Moscow TV]* 47
Central Committee Greets Cinematographers *[PRAVDA]* 47
World Aid Sought for Chernobyl Aftermath *[TASS]* 47
Body Set Up To Monitor Human Rights Complaints *[IZVESTIYA 26 May]* 48
Tension Increases in Coal-Mining Areas *[Moscow Radio]* 48
International 'Management' Magazine Presented *[Moscow Radio]* 48

Economic

USSR Industrial Output Continues To Fall *[Moscow Radio]* 48
Abalkin Interviewed on Switch to Market Economy *[PRAVDA 4 Jun]* 48
Economist on Transition to Market Economy *[IZVESTIYA 27 May]* 53
Role of Management Training in Reforms Cited *[IZVESTIYA 2 Jun]* 57
Finance Minister Pavlov on 'Emergency' Steps *[IZVESTIYA 8 Jun]* 59
Rogachev Assesses Government Economic Program *[Moscow International]* 60
First Congress of Leaseholders' Opens 1 Jun *[Moscow TV]* 61
Bunich Interviewed *[Moscow TV]* 62
Leningrad Plant Converts to Civil Air Production *[Moscow International]* 63
Ekoprom Consortium Plans To Combat Pollution *[Moscow TV]* 63
Single Body To Issue Export, Import Licenses *[PRAVDA 8 Jun]* 63
FRG Food Shipments Delayed in Transport *[TRUD 2 Jun]* 64
Kamchatka Fisheries Switching to Market Relations *[Moscow TV]* 64
Moscow's Severnaya TETS Project Abandoned *[Moscow TV]* 65
Car Factory Feels Rolled Metal Shortage *[Moscow Radio]* 65
Miners Strike Committee Resumption Proposed *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 25 May]* 66
Miners Debate Union Congress Agenda, Venue *[TRUD 5 Jun]* 66

Scientific

Cosmonauts Mark 4 Months in Orbit *[TASS]* 67
Deputies, Officials Visit Semipalatinsk Test Site *[Moscow Radio]* 68
Deputies Tour Site *[TASS]* 68
Deputies Meet Press *[TASS]* 69
'Psychological' Illnesses Noted *[Moscow Radio]* 69

Military

USSR Airspace Violated South of Batumi 9 Jun 70
Defense Ministry Issues Statement *[TASS]* 70
FRG Citizen Extends Greetings *[TRUD 12 Jun]* 70
Rocket Forces Communists Concerned About Situation *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 7 Jun]* 70
Krivosheyev Views Problems of Spring Draft *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 8 Jun]* 71
Zaykov Addresses Western Group of Forces *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 8 Jun]* 73
General Staff Academy Holds Roundtable on Reform *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 27 May]* 75

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Brazauskas, Prunskiene Interviewed on Moscow Visit *[Vilnius Radio]* 79
Ryzhkov Meeting Postponed *[Vilnius International]* 79
Landsbergis Addresses People of Lithuania *[Vilnius Radio]* 80
Landsbergis Considers Lithuania in Warsaw Pact *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 23]* 80
Lithuanian Official Views Disastrous Blockade *[AFP]* 81
'Adequate Supplies' in Vilnius Despite Blockade *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 10 Jun]* 82
Lithuanian Army Deserters' Crimes Reported *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 9 Jun]* 82
Report on 'Provocations' During Lithuanian Draft *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 7 Jun]* 83
Supreme Council Examines Commemorative Dates *[Vilnius Radio]* 84
Lithuania Issues Appeal on 'Ungrounded' Attacks *[Vilnius International]* 84
Publishing House 'Attack' Under Investigation *[Vilnius Radio]* 84
Commercial Weekly Published in Lithuania *[Vilnius Radio]* 84
Estonian Parliament Not To Endorse Tax Law *[Tallinn Radio]* 84
Estonian Labor Council Protests Nazi Rally *[TASS]* 84
More on Rally *[TASS]* 85
Estonian Labor Collectives Council Goals Viewed *[Moscow TV]* 85
Estonian Parliament Views Ownership, Immigration *[Moscow TV]* 86
Estonian Government Freezes Union Assets *[Moscow Radio]* 86
Ryuytel, Others Discuss Visit to Sweden *[Tallinn Radio]* 86

Estonia's Savisaar Meets With Interior Minister *[Tallinn Radio]* 87
Estonian Party Official on Ties With Moscow *[RAHVA HAAL 29 May]* 87
Latvian Supreme Soviet Session Resumes *[Riga Radio]* 88
Judiciary Posts Discussed *[Riga Radio]* 88
Pro-Moscow Latvian Party Congress Held *[TASS]* 89
Correspondent Reports on Latvian Food Rationing *[Moscow TV]* 89
*Latvian Agriculture, Education Ministers Named *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 26 May]* 89
Correction to Appointment of Latvian Ministers 89

RSFSR

Draft Sovereignty Declaration Read at Session *[Moscow TV]* 90
Congress Adopts Sovereignty Amendments *[Moscow TV]* 91
Moscow TV Relays 11 June Congress Proceedings 92
Media Relations Viewed 92
Sovereignty Debated 92
Voting Procedures Debated 93
Voting, Debates on Articles 94
Debates Continue 94
Autonomous Regions Viewed 95
Voting Results Read 96
More on RSFSR Congress Election Results *[Moscow Radio]* 96
Secretariat Views Transcaucasian Refugee Status *[Moscow TV]* 97
Congress Scheduled To End 18 June *[Moscow Radio]* 97
New First Deputy Chairman Khasbulatov Interviewed *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 8 Jun]* 97
Russian Party Initiative Congress Ends *[TASS]* 98
Congress Difficulties Cited *[Moscow Radio]* 98
More on Congress *[PRAVDA 11 Jun]* 99
Russian Communist Party Idea Finds Support *[Moscow International]* 99
Professor Urges Building of New Russian Party *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 1 Jun]* 99
RSFSR Writers Appeal to People, Deputies *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 5 Jun]* 100
Moscow Demonstrators Send Telegram to Gorbachev *[Vilnius Radio]* 101
Russian Youth Magazine To Promote 'Traditions' *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 2 Jun]* 101
Moscow City, Oblast Refugee Problem Examined *[TASS]* 102
Leningrad 'Democratic Platform' Conference Held *[IZVESTIYA 6 Jun]* 102
Kemerovo Oblast First Secretary Interviewed *[PRAVDA 4 Jun]* 103
CPSU's Baklanov Visits Kemerovo Oblast *[PRAVDA 3 Jun]* 105
Siberian Oil Workers To Reduce Supplies *[TASS]* 105
Sverdlovsk Oblast First Secretary Resigns *[TRUD 5 Jun]* 106
Kaluga Votes To Cut Meat Deliveries to Moscow *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 1 Jun]* 106
Khabarovsk Kray Party Conference Takes Recess *[PRAVDA 4 Jun]* 106
Kursk First Secretary Views 28th Congress *[PRAVDA 30 May]* 107
Balakovo Protests Against Nuclear Power Station *[Moscow TV]* 109
Tomsk Oblast Elects New First Secretary *[PRAVDA 5 Jun]* 110
Vorkuta Miners Still Considering General Strike *[Moscow TV]* 110
Volgograd Consumer Council Raises Food Prices *[Moscow TV]* 111

Western Republics

New Moldavian Premier Interviewed on Tasks *[Moscow Radio]* 111
New Situation in Moldavia Reported *[Moscow TV]* 112
Russians in Moldavia Ignore Language Law *[Moscow TV]* 112
Moldavia's Victims of Stalinism Form Association *[TASS]* 112
Thatcher Visits Kiev Exhibitions in Ukraine *[TASS]* 113
Ivashko Meets Ukraine Komsomol Congress Delegates *[Moscow Radio]* 113
Conference on Ukrainian Diaspora Ends 11 Jun *[TASS]* 113
Miners Congress Opens in Donetsk 11 Jun *[TASS]* 114
Ukrainian Nuclear Power Plant Picketed *[AFP]* 114
Transcarpathia To Switch to European Mean Time *[Kiev Radio]* 114
Oblast Soviet Stops Radar Station Construction *[Moscow TV]* 114

Caucasus

General Calls for Disarming Armenian 'Bandits' *[Baku Radio]* 114
Russian Refugees Disavow Armenian Nationalists *[Baku Radio]* 115
New Armenian Komsomol Paper Published *[Yerevan KOMMUNIST 23 May]* 115
New First Secretary Elected for Megrinskiy Rayon *[Yerevan Radio]* 115
Confusion Reported in Second Armenian Elections *[Yerevan Radio]* 115
Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet Session Detailed *[Baku Radio]* 115
State of Emergency Prposed *[Moscow Radio]* 115
Minister Arrives in Baku To Discuss Railways *[Baku Radio]* 116
Georgian Paper Reports Independence Day Events *[ZARYA VOSTOKA 27 May]* 116
Georgia's Abkhaz Forum Demands Leaders Resign *[ZARYA VOSTOKA 29 May]* 117

Central Asia

Continuing Reportage on Disorder in Kirghizia 117
Situation at Uzbekistan Border *[Moscow TV]* 117
Poverty Blamed for Disorder *[Moscow Radio]* 118
Regions' Prime Ministers Meet *[AFP]* 118
Situation Reportedly 'Stabilizing' *[TASS]* 119
Death Toll Reported at 139 *[TASS]* 119
Sydykov Elected Chairman of Osh Oblast Soviet *[SOVETSKAYA KIRGHIZIYA 25 May]* 119
Kazakh Communist Party Holds 17th Congress 119
Republic's Sovereignty Discussed *[Moscow TV]* 119
Gorbachev Candidature Recommended *[Moscow Radio]* 120
People's Deputy Delegation Visits Semipalatinsk *[TASS]* 120
6 Jun Flood Damage in Tadzhik SSR Noted *[Dushanbe Radio]* 120
Saudi Clergy Discuss Ties With Uzbek Muslims *[Moscow TV]* 120

U.S.-USSR Disarmament Agreements Viewed

WA1106191490 Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 23, 9-15 Jun 90 pp 1, 2

[Report on interview with USSR Deputy Foreign Minister V. Karpov, conducted by NOVOSTI diplomatic observer V. Markov; place and date not given: "Balance of Interests"]

[Text] USSR President M.S. Gorbachev's visit to the United States, in the course of which a whole package of agreements was signed, including in the sphere of disarmament, is successfully over.

At the request of ARGUMENTY I FAKTY, Deputy USSR Foreign Minister V. Karpov answers the questions of NOVOSTI diplomatic observer V. Markov.

[Markov] The presidents of the USSR and the United States signed a joint statement in Washington on the basic principles of a future strategic offensive arms limitation and reduction treaty. It is contemplated signing the treaty itself by the end of this year. What is the content of its basic provisions which the presidents have succeeded in agreeing upon even now?

[Karpov] We are talking about the presidents' adoption of a joint document which sets forth the understandings reached in the course of intensive negotiations. They concern primarily limitations on both countries' strategic offensive arms in the following quantity: 1,600 delivery systems and 6,000 nuclear warheads. The document also determines the procedure for counting the number of warheads on ballistic missiles and tallying nuclear warheads on cruise missiles. It goes on to determine how many missiles may be replaced and on what terms, how this replacement will be accomplished, and what reserve of missiles—above and beyond those already in silos or on launchers—the parties may possess in order to maintain the necessary level of missile forces.

A large place in the joint statement is assigned questions of monitoring and inspection activity, including an arms manufacturing observation system. The document also regulates questions connected with the timetables for the destruction of the parties' arms over and above the authorized quantities and the methods of their dismantling and elimination.

[Markov] What is the balance of interests which it has been possible to achieve on the contentious issues of the limitation of air- and sea-launched cruise missiles (ALCM and SLCM)?

[Karpov] Two issues, in the main, were discussed concerning ALCMs at the negotiating stage directly preceding the summit, primarily during Secretary of State Baker's visit to Moscow. The first concerned the range of the missiles at which they come under the provisions of the treaty and are counted as a unit in the 6,000 nuclear warheads level. We proposed 600 km, the United States 800 km (although they had originally insisted on a range of 1,500 km).

In Moscow the Americans expressed consent to our proposal—the establishment of a range for ALCMs of 600 km if we, for our part, accommodated them on the issue of the new American Tacit Rainbow missile. It was determined that missiles of greater range which had been tested prior to 31 December 1988 would come under the provisions of the treaty and, what is more, that they would all be considered nuclear. The American Tacit Rainbow missile which, according to American assurances will remain nonnuclear, was deemed not to come under the provisions of a START treaty.

The second question connected with ALCM's was whether or not a ceiling should be determined on the number of heavy bombers (HB). Recent Soviet proposals set forth in a letter from Eduard Shevardnadze of 11 May to the U.S. secretary of state provided for the establishment of a heavy bomber ceiling of 120. The American side, which had originally turned down this idea altogether, then proposed a ceiling of 180 HB's. The United States currently has almost 190 HB's with ALCM's, the USSR less than half as many. The compromise solution which was negotiated is a ceiling of 150 HB's for the United States.

[Markov] How was the problem of counting ALCM's on heavy bombers solved?

[Karpov] This problem was agreed upon by way of the establishment of a kind of coefficient. Ten cruise missiles are counted on American HB's, eight on the Soviet HB's. These are provisional figures because the Americans, say, now have bombers which carry 12 missiles in the main. They could in the future have HB's with 20 missiles even. A 20-missile ceiling is now established which cannot be exceeded. Soviet TBs are fitted with six missiles in the main, but in time, for example, the Tu-160 bombers will be fitted with 12 cruise missiles. The Soviet side has undertaken not to deploy more than 12 missiles on its bombers. But for the purpose of compensation the USSR may, according to the arrangement, have 40 percent more HB's with ALCM's.

[Markov] To what did the problem of limiting long-range SLCM's at the final stage of the negotiations prior to the summit amount?

[Karpov] To determination of the overall ceiling of SLCM's over the whole term of the treaty—15 years. After they had for a long time refused to establish any ceiling in this respect, in recent weeks the Americans proposed to agree to such at the 1,000-missile level. The Soviet side proposed a 600-missile limit. In addition, we advocated that SLCM's with a range of 600 km and more be counted within this ceiling. As a result we agreed here also on a range of 600 km and also on a ceiling for the SLCM's of 880, and, what is more, the parties will annually exchange data on the plans to deploy these missiles over a five-year period.

[Markov] The treaty on whose basic provisions both presidents reached agreement is now no longer called a treaty on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive arms....

[Karpov] To take the reduction in nuclear warheads, they will indeed be reduced by half: 6,000 nuclear warheads is approximately 50 percent of their present American level. To judge, however, by strategic nuclear weapon delivery systems, 1,600 do not constitute half either of the American or the Soviet levels. The United States has approximately 2,200, the USSR approximately 2,400.

The fact that the Americans did not agree to include SLCM's within the 6,000-warhead ceiling means that in respect of these also the actual reductions will be less than 50 percent. If these are considered deficiencies of a START treaty, they may, I hope, be filled in future agreements.

[Markov] When will START II negotiations begin?

[Karpov] As soon, obviously, as the START treaty is ratified.

U.S. Negotiator Says Summit Opened Way for Cuts

LD0806110890 Moscow TASS in English 1038 GMT 8 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Robert Serebrennikov]

[Text] Madrid June 8 TASS—Chief U.S. negotiator at nuclear and space weapons talks in Geneva Richard Burt said that the Soviet-U.S. summit brought the two positions closer together, setting the ground for signing first-ever agreement to reduce strategic nuclear weapons by year's end.

This will help stabilise military relations and reduce the risk of a nuclear conflict, he said, in an interview broadcast via satellite to Madrid, Hamburg, Rome and Ottawa.

The two superpowers aim in the 1990s to promote nuclear stability and increase openness in the nuclear field, he said.

The United States will not renege on agreements with Great Britain in response to the Soviet wish to include the British deployment of U.S.-made Trident submarines in disarmament talks, he said.

'Last Meeting of Superpowers' Discussed

PM0606154890 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 21, 3-10 Jun 90 p 3

[Article by Andrey Kortunov: "The Last Meeting of the Superpowers"]

[Text] The lack of clarity in the results of the coming Soviet-American summit notwithstanding, it is already safe to say that this meeting will go down in history as the last summit between the two superpowers. The USSR and the USA are losing their status as superpowers, rapidly losing their power to control international developments. In fact, the Soviet Union has already stopped being a superpower—the Warsaw treaty is losing its efficiency and the Soviet economy is in dire straits; now even its further existence within the old frontiers has been called into question. While still clinging to the symbols of erstwhile power, the United States has likewise been losing its position as a superpower: centrifugal trends have been gaining momentum in NATO; Eastern Asia has been advancing on the American markets and buying up American enterprises; and the spectre of an economically and politically independent Europe looms on the horizon.

The system of world priorities has likewise been changing, albeit at a slow pace. The problems of strategic stability, military balance, blocs and arms limitations are being replaced with more "down-to-earth" questions—international debt, interest rates, drugs and ecology.

The change of status in international affairs has proved rather painful for both countries. The sentiments of isolationism are already clearly pronounced both in the USSR and USA: in this country, for example, some are in favour of giving up the East European countries as a bad job and renouncing all relations with the Third World. In America there is irritation with regard to the integration of Western Europe, growing anti-Japanese feeling, and a revival of the concept of "America the fortress".

The coming meeting, I believe, must not only advance bilateral relations, but also chart ways towards adapting the superpowers to the new global situation. The process of the old international system's disintegration—if it far outstrips the establishment of a new world order—can entail not only the "departure" of the USSR and the USA from many regions, but bring increasing chaos.

The last meeting between the leaders of the superpowers could become the first real step forward on the way to creating a new world order. First, the USSR and the USA could jointly activize the existing multilateral mechanisms of international cooperation and assist in forming new ones: for maintaining regional stability, for control over arms sales and supplies of military hardware, for bolstering non-proliferation, etc. Second, the sides could reach agreement on joint initiatives concerning regional problems: in Europe—the reduction of their military presence to the minimum and abolition of the Soviet and American ground-based tactical nuclear systems; in Central America—abolishing deliveries of offensive weapons; in the Far East—discussion over the prospects for the two Korean states' reunification with corresponding guarantees for the USSR and the USA; in the gulf area—debating ways to decrease their naval presence.

In so doing, it would be highly important for both countries to take account of each other's objective weaknesses. Specifically, the American leadership must be clearly aware that in the USSR questions of foreign policy are becoming an object of inner political struggle. The US administration's growing pressure on Gorbachev can strengthen the conservatives in the USSR, whereas their desire to secure the most favourable terms in disarmament treaties may ultimately mean that these treaties will not be ratified by the Supreme Soviet. For the USSR, in its turn, there is a need to bear in mind that radical proposals for disarmament are bound to evoke scepticism and mistrust in the USA. As long as the USSR's political future looks vague and withdrawals in foreign and home policy are seen as feasible by the West it would hardly be fair to criticize the American side for being overcautious and lacking imagination.

Having discontinued being superpowers, the USSR and the USA can remain great powers and active participants in the international system. But each of these countries has yet to find its new role in the world and its new place in this system.

Work to coordinate the restructuring of the international system is just beginning. It will inevitably turn out to be far less effective and much more painstaking than the effort to destroy the old. The talks in Washington will have to stimulate this quest and should help the leaders of the USSR and the USA to overcome this difficult period in the history of the two countries more rapidly and easily.

Foreign Policy Initiatives Termed 'Untimely'

LD1206070490 Moscow TASS in English 0614 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 12 TASS—A top-ranking Soviet Communist Party official described some Soviet foreign policy initiatives as "untimely" in the context of the current world situation.

Oleg Baklanov, secretary of the Communist Party Central Committee, told the RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA newspaper, published today, that the proposals were "correct and basically new, but sometimes they fail to evoke a response from our Western partners."

He explained that "no one flatly rejects" new political thinking, but "far from everything that we propose meets with a positive response from the North Atlantic alliance."

"The Warsaw Pact is radically changing its essence, developing into an organisation that is more political than military," Baklanov noted.

The Pact recently called for the creation of a new European security system and a united Europe of peace and cooperation, but NATO has made no specific proposals.

"Our Western partners would like to proceed from premises that are advantageous only to them and to recognise our concerns and interests only in word, without responding with any specific steps in adequate foreign policy and arms control areas," Baklanov said.

"Such a correlation of positions reveals no adequancy in approaches and gives no hope for mutual confidence, which we would like to establish in interstate relations.

"We are withdrawing our troops from central Europe and reducing their strength in a unilateral way. Shortly, we go and NATO stays, growing stronger and stronger, as far as i can judge."

Baklanov said the correlation of forces in Europe "is not in favour of parity."

"There are numerous signs that NATO is using the new situation on the continent to pursue its selfish aims, creating an imbalance in forces," he emphasised.

Foreign Ministry Official Views Emigration Law

WA0806192190 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 23, 6 Jun 90 p 2

[Report on interview with Vladimir Petrovskiy, USSR deputy minister of foreign affairs, by L. Zagalskiy; place and date not specified: "The Right To Emigrate"]

[Text] As recently as several years ago the very thought of a Soviet person being given an opportunity to leave his own country and come back to it without any permission by the authorities, by merely using his passport, would have seemed not only fantastic but wild. However, here I am holding in my hands a draft law "On Procedures for USSR Citizens Leaving the USSR and Entering the USSR." This draft has been worked on further and it is ready for a second reading in the Supreme Soviet of the country. However... to this day it has not only failed to be adopted but even fully discussed.

Indeed, life abounds in paradoxes.

Of course, the adoption of this law could wait. First, it is too unusual for our society which even now is not all that open. Second, economic issues are definitely a priority at present. However, as became known in the course of a meeting between the American and Soviet Presidents, many of its participants associated its success with among other things the adoption of this law. After all, to this day no one has repealed the well-known Jackson-Vanik amendment which directly ties permission to emigrate freely from the Soviet Union to the principle of most favored nation status in trade.

Well, the law has not been adopted and this means that some more time will pass before our country fully complies with the obligations it assumed in Geneva and Helsinki. The thing that is dearest today—pace—has been lost.

So, what does the law provide for? We discussed this with Deputy Foreign Affairs Minister Vladimir Fedorovich Petrovskiy.

[Zagalskiy] So, judging by the draft law the USSR has come close to a majority of civilized countries. Nonetheless there are still places in the text that are unclear. For example, the text says that a passport for foreign travel provides sufficient grounds for traveling to all countries of the world. Is this to say that a Soviet individual who has his passport in hand may immediately head to the ticket office to buy a ticket?

[Petrovskiy] The draft law suggests that from now on USSR citizens will not need any special permission or some special exit visa. They will receive passports for five years.

[Zagalskiy] What will the functions of the OVIR's [visa and registration departments] be in this case?

[Petrovskiy] They will have plenty of work, though I do not think that there will be lines. The OVIR's will issue passports, register dues, and process the paperwork of foreigners. We should say that under the law the technical aspect of operations of the OVIR's as well complies with the provisions of the Helsinki and Vienna agreements. The duration of processing requests to leave, providing written responses to applications, and procedures for the appeal of negative decisions are shortened.

[Zagalskiy] Let us imagine that the law has been adopted. Thousands of our fellow citizens would want to travel abroad for various reasons: to work, to study, to reside permanently with relatives and loved ones; tourism would expand incredibly. The law changes for the better the life of millions of people and makes it freer. Will the country have enough hard currency to exchange it for our hard-earned rubles, and will there be enough transportation in order to carry the mass of those willing to travel from the USSR to various points in the world? Besides, could one's own apartment in the USSR and place of work be retained?

[Petrovskiy] The questions you have asked show that a tremendous number of social and economic problems will arise. All of this calls for skillful work and, perhaps, revising the foundations of legislation. At the same time we must understand once and for all that contacts between the people are vitally necessary for our development, that they are becoming the foundation of the new world which is being created today.

However, the issue of the brain drain cannot but concern us...

[Zagalskiy] There has been much discussion about this recently. The point of view was put forth that the best minds of the country will leave it, having been offered better conditions for personal development.

[Petrovskiy] I would like to note two aspects. First, while uttering thousands of words about patriotism over many decades, we approached the issues of emigration from the country from, so to say, "the presumption of treason." By believing that our talented people would definitely want to remain abroad permanently we only impoverish ourselves.

Incidentally, there is a quite significant economic aspect involved. In many countries whose citizens go abroad, including for work, the transfer of their wages is a substantial source of hard currency revenues. All that is important is to use this opportunity reasonably through economic levers—a sound tax policy and modern banking legislation. Second, this is not a purely Soviet problem. It affects many other developed countries. Even in the United States concerned voices are heard regarding the emigration of specialists to Japan. Therefore this problem should also be solved together through a joint effort by all states. However, it is necessary to move forward, according to the well-known formula "the free development of everyone is a condition for the free development of all," rather than backward toward "serfdom." Why shouldn't the world community ponder the development of such legal and other norms as would facilitate the free transfer of ideas and scientific-technical knowledge? In particular, the Italian idea of an "open" laboratory is fruitful. The main point is to borrow and jointly perfect the international experience of creating in each country a maximum of favorable conditions for creativity, including scientific-technical creativity, for the implementation of discoveries and so on. I believe that this is the key to solving our problems. An international dialogue on these issues would be useful both for our country and other states.

[Zagalskiy] Still, let us go back to hard currency and transportation.

[Petrovskiy] The state should ensure a certain amount of hard currency to be exchanged. Quotas and procedures for exchanging money should be established by the USSR Supreme Soviet on the suggestion of the USSR Council of Ministers. However, I believe that an individual should use his personal funds if he is traveling on personal business. Unfortunately, our country does not have all that much currency. This is why all those emigrating for permanent residence abroad will be given very limited funds for now. Alas, this is an economic rather than a political issue. The sooner the ruble becomes convertible the better. As far as transportation is concerned, it is obvious that there are going to be difficulties in this sphere when travel from the USSR increases.

[Zagalskiy] References to so-called secrecy are one of the most common forms of refusals for emigration from the USSR. In the process, the periods of time by which permissions are postponed are downright monstrous at times. Has something changed in the new law?

[Petrovskiy] Yes, and a lot. In this matter as well the Ministry of Foreign Affairs advocates international legal norms. The creators of the draft law took the same approach. It is no accident that the last article of the law states: "If an international treaty of the USSR establishes rules other than those contained in the present law, the rules of the international treaty apply." This is not all either. The maximum (by world standards) duration of restrictions—five years—is established. When employees are hired they are definitely going to be told what restrictions on travel (and for how long) they will be subjected to. A relevant entry in the labor record booklet to this effect should be made. The same will be the case during induction into military service. All issues associated with state secrets should only be resolved on the basis on which they are resolved in the civilized world.

[Zagalskiy] Apparently, all of these standards are published in civilized states?

[Petrovskiy] Of course. The fact that all norms of behavior are published in the civilized world is what makes it civilized.

[Zagalskiy] How will the rights of children whose parents are leaving the country be ensured?

[Petrovskiy] The draft law contains a special article providing for the emigration of citizens who have not turned 18. The emigration of children between the ages of 14 and 18 may proceed only if a written consent of their legal representatives is available. If a child is under 14 his emigration proceeds with the consent of his parents.

[Zagalskiy] What if one of the parents does not want to let his child go abroad? Is the right to take the issue to courts envisaged?

[Petrovskiy] Yes, the courts will review such cases.

[Zagalskiy] However, they have no practice at all...

[Petrovskiy] Soviet courts in general do not have international practice. They still have a lot to do in order to comply with world standards.

[Zagalskiy] Therefore will the adoption of this law call for a tremendous amount of new resolutions and quasi-legal acts?

[Petrovskiy] I very much dislike this combination of words—"quasi-legal acts." There is something insidious about it. All acts should be legal. As experience shows, it is exactly all of these numerous instructions that give grounds for lawlessness.

[Zagalskiy] I would like to clarify the situation of citizens emigrating to Israel. According to an ukase of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium they are deprived of Soviet passports. Is this legal?

[Petrovskiy] The new draft is expected to declare this ukase void. The ukase on depriving emigrants to Israel of citizenship has always drawn criticism abroad. The point is that our legislation on citizenship provides for the deprivation of citizenship only on an individual basis and only for specific antipatriotic deeds.

[Zagalskiy] However, in this case emigrants to Israel will have two passports, a Soviet and an Israeli. What does the legislation in effect say about this?

[Petrovskiy] This should be regulated by a different law, the law on citizenship. The international practice of resolving such issues needs to be called upon to help.

[Zagalskiy] One final question. Why does everything proceed so slowly?

[Petrovskiy] Our conversation itself has shown that the new law affects many spheres of our life. One thing leads to another, and this goes on forever. Nonetheless, this is no justification for delays. Of course all the issues arising are complex, but they certainly do not pose an insurmountable obstacle to adopting the law. Besides, they can very well be resolved at the same time, simultaneously, rather than one after the other. The new law is necessary both from the point of view of complying with the international obligations assumed by us and, no less important, from the standpoint of enhancing the democratization of Soviet society and the formation of the state of law in our country.

State Bank Chief Views New European Bank

PM1106100190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Yu. Kovalenko dispatch: "Financial Help for Reform"]

[Text] Paris—As has already been reported, representatives of 40 states, the EEC, and the European Investment Bank have signed an agreement in Paris to set up the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development [EBRD].

Its aim, as Article I of the agreement states, is to promote progress and economic reconstruction in the countries of Central and East Europe. These countries pledge to adhere to the principles of pluralist democracy, to promote their transition to a market economy, and to encourage private initiative and a spirit of enterprise.

The new bank's capital will be $12 billion. The European ECU and the Japanese yen will be accounting units alongside the U.S. currency. The EEC is investing 51 percent of the capital, the United States 10 percent, Japan 8 percent, and the Soviet Union six percent. Sixty percent of credits will be allocated to the private sector and 40 percent to the state sector.

Jacques Attali, special adviser to the French president, has been chosen as president of the EBRD. The bank's headquarters will be in London. Russian will be one of the working languages, and our financiers will work in its secretariat. EBRD departments will be opened in all the founder countries including the USSR.

The bank, F. Mitterrand stated at the official agreement signing ceremony in the Elysee Palace, will be able to act as a link between Western capital and know how and Eastern production. It will promote not only a concentration of capital but also a combination of people, states, and mutual interests.

"Can the establishment of the EBRD be considered the first step on the way to the creation of an East-West European confederation?" I asked the French president.

"Yes, it can," F. Mitterrand replied, "insofar as it corresponds to my idea, although I did not mention this in my speech. Indeed, for the first time all the European states—along with certain others—have decided to participate in a single financial organization."

Well, what does the Soviet Union expect from this new financial institution, which is expected to conduct its first operations in spring 1991?

"The EBRD will assist the processes of economic restructuring both in the East European countries and in the USSR," V.V. Gerashchenko, head of the Soviet delegation and chairman of the USSR Gosbank [State Bank] Board, stressed. "I particularly want to note that credits will be given not to a country but to its organizations, firms, plants, factories, joint-stock societies, and private companies which, bypassing all authorities, will be able to deal with the bank directly. And questions of their allocation will be decided on the basis of the principle of economic expediency.

"The new bank," V.V. Gerashchenko went on to say, "will to a certain extent be able to bring order to our finances and help us to understand just what the real cost of money in the USSR should be."

[Kovalenko] But is the USSR in fact a full EBRD member for the time being? During the three-year transitional period we will be able to make use of credits equivalent to the size of our contributions...

[Gerashchenko] During the discussions which preceded the signing of the agreement, many people expressed a fear that the USSR's needs are so great that we might absorb a large proportion of resources. That is why we compromised, but in the future these restrictions will be lifted.

[Kovalenko] Clearly, the next stage will be for the Soviet Union to join key financial organizations such as the IMF and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development?

[Gerashchenko] Yes, in principle. We are currently discussing these issues. We have already established our

first contacts, but the process is not simple. Here we come up against the U.S. position, which is excessively political... [Gerashchenko ends]

But let's return to the EBRD. Just what credits can we obtain from it? Can we really not get them on a bilateral basis?

Ultimately, I was told by the experts with whom I chatted after the signing of the agreement the kind of credits granted to the Soviet Union are not so important. We have already received very many credits, and the problem is to make efficient use of these funds and to know what to invest them in. And the experience accumulated by the West in this area and its ability to "frame" projects and provide technical and economic backup for them is of immense interest to us.

Finally, one other point to which my interlocutors drew attention. For too long we have been isolated and cut off from the world financial community. Under present conditions the "human factor" of communications, familiarity, and direct contact at the highest level with the people making international financial policy is of immense importance in banking.

UN Committee on Peaceful Use of Space Meets

Space Inspectorate Suggested

LD0806102290 Moscow TASS in English 0731 GMT 8 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Nikolay Maslov]

[Text] United Nations June 8 TASS—A session of the U.N. Committee on the Peaceful Use of Outer Space on Thursday started a general discussion of ways and means to implement the committee's aim.

The Soviet and U.S. Presidents at the recent Washington summit stated that the two countries are planning to cooperate in space exploration, but space still remains in the domain of the arms race, Mexican representative Arturo Hernandes Basave said.

The committee bears a specific responsibility for safeguarding peaceful international cooperation in outer space.

The peaceful use of outer space should not be mixed up with disarmament issues, and the committee is not empowered to discuss them, U.S. representative Kenneth Hodgkins said.

Delegates from Chile, Hungary and India called for the committee's active cooperation with international bodies, such as the conference for disarmament, and for strengthening confidence-building measures in outer space activities.

The implementation of a proposal for open outer space could become an important step in this direction, Soviet representative Boris Khabirov said. The Soviet Union suggested that an international space inspection be initiated with access to all objects to be launched and put in space.

The Soviet Union proposed declaring the programme to explore Mars the international community's common project. It could become the first interstate space programme and the U.N. could play an important role, Khabirov said.

'Consensus' on Principles Reached

LD1206071590 Moscow TASS in English 0650 GMT 12 June 90

[By TASS correspondent Nikolay Maslov]

[Text] United Nations June 12 TASS—A session of the U.N. Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space on Monday finished discussing the main item on the agenda: technical aspects of the use of nuclear power in outer space.

The session's recommendations are expected to accelerate the elaboration of safety principles.

For the first time, a session of the legal subcommittee reached consensus on main principles and criteria for the safe use of nuclear power in outer space, subcommittee chairman Vaclav Mikulka said.

Soviet representative Boris Khabirov noted that the Soviet Union plans to conduct thorough safety assessment of space apparatuses with nuclear power at all stages of a flight. The Soviet Union's readiness to publish the results of such investigations is another manifestation of its policy of glasnost, he said.

The session assessed the implementation of the U.N. programm on the use of space equipment and recommendations of the second U.N. Unispace-82 conference on research and peaceful use of outer space.

The majority of participants agreed that the effective solution of problems is possible only in conditions of wide-scale cooperation in space.

European Police Chiefs Attend Meeting

PM1106151990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Jun 90 Second Edition p 6

[Report by own correspondent I. Melnikov under "Specially for PRAVDA" rubric: "Who Sets the Example for Whom? Interview With a Soviet Participant in an International Meeting"]

[Text] Vienna—The current meeting of European capitals' police chiefs is the 12th, the first having been held in 1924. The meetings, which have become regular of late, are of a businesslike nature. Their participants, who possess a wealth of professional experience, devise specific measures and recommendations for fighting crime. Questions of international collaboration among law-enforcement organs have also been tackled productively.

It is the general opinion that the participation of representatives of East European countries' internal affairs ministries, who have come to the meeting for the first time, has helped to guarantee this.

This was where our conversation with Petr Bogdanov, Moscow militia chief and USSR deputy minister of internal affairs, began.

"I want to stress the phrase 'for the first time,'" my interlocutor said. "It was very often mentioned during the conference and invariably with satisfaction, with an appreciation of the fact that the participation of representatives of East European states, particularly the USSR, will impart new momentum to the exchange of international experience."

[Melnikov] What useful information did you gain from the meeting?

[Bogdanov] In the first place, I would mention the fact that some of the problems are common problems. My colleagues drew attention to the fact that the prestige of the police has declined everywhere to some extent of late. This is due to the increase in crime. People are worried and they do not see any rapid changes for the better. There was another aspect, mentioned by everyone—the media are not too helpful when it comes to providing an objective picture of the processes that are taking place.

[Melnikov] Now a rather lengthy question. For a number of years I have been able to observe the actions of the Austrian police. I would mention two of their qualities. First, a sense of proportion. An Austrian police officer would not allow himself to break traffic rules unless it was absolutely essential. He sets an example of how to behave on the highway. The second feature is that he treats foreigners and his compatriots alike, and he has as much respect for his own people as for foreigners. How would you rate these qualities?

[Bogdanov] I like them very much. I regret that some of our militia officers do not possess these qualities. It is a problem for us—improving officers' conduct. I repeat, I am impressed by these qualities, they help us in our work and they arouse civic sympathy.

[Melnikov] If we consider various professional aspects—technical, methodological, psychological—what would you like to borrow from the West?

[Bogdanov] I would say without hesitation—technology. By and large, our officers are not at a disadvantage when it comes to methodology and professional standards.

[Melnikov] Are we going to catch up?

[Bogdanov] We will. And we do not only have plans. A number of contracts have been signed and the technology is arriving right now. Things are happening....

Allies Could Share East Berlin War Museum

PM1106112990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Jun 90 Second Edition p 6

[Own Correspondent S. Baygarov report under "Museum of the Day" rubric: "The 'Unknown War:' Thoughts in the Museum of the Surrender in Berlin"]

[Excerpts] Berlin—The process of unification of the GDR and the FRG affects not only our country's strategic interests but also economic interests and, in particular, questions of ownership. It has come to light, for example, that the entire postwar period was not enough for us to legally enshrine the right to various pieces of real estate—in other words, homes and land.

Only now have people begun thinking about it and, in the usual slapdash way, begun doing something about it. The near future will show how successfully this work will be completed. This report, however, is concerned with just one building—the museum dedicated to the unconditional surrender of the fascist Wehrmacht [passage omitted].

The museum now belongs to the Soviet Western Group of Forces, stationed on what is now GDR territory. Why not transfer the building to the control of our government? For example, make it a branch of the USSR Armed Forces Central Museum? That would undoubtedly enhance its prestige and make the museum's future more secure than it is at present.

Here is another idea, put forward by the museum's present chief, Major Vladimir Vitalyevich Lukin. The point is that we are showing the history of the war from a Great Patriotic War perspective. However, the surrender was accepted by representatives of the four victors. And it is no secret that we know almost as little about their combat actions during World War II as they do about the "unknown Eastern Front." More than once I have seen many people emerging from the museum looking simply stunned. That includes Germans from the GDR for whom "official" history only began in 1945.

Major Lukin proposes dividing the museum into four equal sections and leasing three of them in perpetuity to the representatives of the United States, Britain, and France so that they can organize an exhibition showing their view of World War II.

I think that this idea merits attention. I believe that our former allies would support it. In any event its implementation would benefit the museum and others, too. After all, it was just such an international museum that our legendary Marshal Georgiy Konstantinovich Zhukov used to dream of.

United States & Canada

Reportage, Commentary on Gorbachev Visit

Gorbachev Hails Outcome

LD1206080590 Moscow TASS in English 0758 GMT 12 June 90

[By TASS correspondents Vladimir Isachenkov and Andrey Orlov]

[Text] Moscow June 12 TASS—Speaking in parliament today, President Mikhail Gorbachev praised the outcome of his visits to the United States and Canada.

Despite speculation and dire forecasts, the talks were open, substantial and equal, he said.

The sides met each other half way. This accounts for the talks' success and to the increasing stock of trust that has been accumulating since Malta, he said.

The U.S. Administration and President Bush withstood great pressure from various sides, maintaining a balanced, responsible approach to radical reforms in the Soviet Union, he said.

Gorbachev on Arms Agreements

LD1206101190 Moscow TASS in English 0938 GMT 12 Jun 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Andrey Orlov and Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text] Moscow, June 12 TASS—The Soviet-U.S. summit completed the coordination of the main provisions of the future agreement on the reduction of strategic offensive weapons by 50 per cent, which was started in Reykjavik, President Mikhail Gorbachev told the Soviet Parliament today. He was speaking on the results of his visit to the United States and Canada.

A real opportunity to complete preparations and sign the treaty this year have been created, Gorbachev said. He stressed the equivalence of the forthcoming Soviet and U.S. strategic arms reductions.

A very important agreement to reduce chemical weapons by 80 per cent was signed, which can be followed by an agreement on their full elimination, the president said.

The sides also signed protocols to agreements on the limitation of underground nuclear weapons tests and on underground nuclear blasts for peaceful purposes. This will allow the ratification of the agreements signed as early as the middle of the 1970s. This is a step on the road to a complete nuclear test ban, Gorbachev said.

An agreement has been reached on measures against the proliferation of nuclear and chemical weapons, combat missiles capable of carrying such weapons and corresponding technologies, Gorbachev said.

Reagan Cited on Gorbachev

LD1206082590 Moscow TASS in English 0802 GMT 12 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Maxim Knyazkov]

[Text] New York June 12 TASS—Former U.S. President Ronald Reagan contributed to THE NEW YORK TIMES an article entitled "I'm Convinced That Gorbachev Wants a Free-Market Democracy." The newspaper published the article on Tuesday.

"The other day over coffee in San Francisco I saw Mikhail Gorbachev," the former president writes. "He was every bit as warm, earnest and optimistic about his country's future potental as I remember him from our previous meetings."

Yet, back home he faces an array of problems that would daunt a less vigorous man: a surge of nationalism, a drumbeat of criticism over the lack of consumer goods, complaints about the lack of hard currency with which to make needed purchases of machinery and equipment, Reagan writes.

"I'm convinced that Mr. Gorbachev is sincerely determined to convert the Soviet Union to a free market democracy," Reagan stresses.

The former U.S. President called on the U.S. Administration to develop business cooperation and bilateral trade with the Soviet Union including supplies of technology to the USSR.

Americans Take Positive View

LD1206103290 Moscow TASS in English 1021 GMT 12 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Maksim Knyazkov]

[Text] New York June 12 TASS—Most Americans believe that the recent Soviet-American summit was very useful and say that they approve of the policy of the Soviet and U.S. Presidents towards improving bilateral relations, according to a public opinion poll conducted by THE NEW YORK TIMES and the CBS TV network.

Eighty-one per cent of those polled said the Washington summit helped promote peace and security. Twenty-four per cent praised its contribution to peace.

Most Americans regard the summit as an example of mutually beneficial cooperation between the two countries. Fifty-seven per cent of respondents said the United States and the Soviet Union profited from agreements concluded at the summit. Forty-nine per cent supported the granting of most favoured nation trade status to the Soviet Union and an all-round development of commercial relations with it.

The popularity of Gorbachev and Bush soared after the summit. Gorbachev's popularity rose by six per cent and 51 per cent of those polled said they were positive about

Gorbachev. Fifty-five per cent stressed that it is in U.S. interests for Gorbachev to remain at the helm in the Soviet Union.

Bush's foreign policy approval rating grew by five per cent during the summit, with 62 per cent approving of his overseas policy. His overall approval rate is 69 per cent, as in May.

However, the survey has shown that much has still to be done to remove mistrust, suspicion and confrontation thinking in relations between the two nations. Fifty-two per cent said they did not think the cold war was over.

Commentary Notes Improving Relations

LD0606104990 Moscow World Service in English 2300 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Text] President Gorbachev ended his official visit to the United States on Monday. What place will the visit take in the history of international relations? Vladislav Kozyakov has this commentary:

The two great powers are reaching a new level of relations, those marked not by confrontation but by growing trust and cooperation. The Soviet Union and the United States have taken the way mapped out in Malta, the way of cooperation and partnership. This is the result of a whole package of important agreements in Washington concerning arms cuts, cultural exchanges, and other contacts—but not only that. The attitude to those problems which haven't been solved yet is also evidence of partnership. For instance, that is true of the external aspects of Germany's unification. Differences remain, but suspicion invariably present in the past has gone. At the negotiations in Washington both countries voiced the desire to understand each other's position better, and together with other countries to look for an agreement that would suit all. Efforts along these lines will continue at the meetings the foreign ministers of the two countries are having in Copenhagen and at the two-plus-four talks and other conferences.

President Gorbachev compared the current state of Soviet-U.S. relations with the emergence of partnership relations between the Soviet Union, the United States, and other allied powers during World War II. Ideological differences were then ignored for the sake of the struggle against nazism that threatened civilization. The point at issue today is cooperation of similar scale and importance. The Soviet leader said so in an interview for Soviet television in Washington. Incidentally, half a century ago there were politicians in the United States who campaigned against the Soviet Union. It took the political courage of the then President Franklin Roosevelt to overcome resistance at home and establish cooperation with the Soviet Union that would lead to the victory over the forces of aggression. Deplorably, one can hear the voices of those opposed to closer relations with the Soviet Union today too. There had even been calls for cancelling the Soviet president's visit or suspending certain agreements. So, in the current situation, too, not everything goes on smoothly in building new relations.

President Bush must display statesmanship and respond to the Soviet policy of new thinking. During Gorbachev's visit quite a few encouraging reports (?arrived). The president not only concluded many agreements but also frank conversations in private, and agreed on [words indistinct]. Major business contracts were signed too and the companies involved at once improved their ratings at the stock exchange. The Soviet president's meetings in the White House and also those he had with the leaders of business, students, and ordinary people on the streets, leave no doubt that the overwhelming majority of the Americans are for new relations of partnership between our two countries. The Soviet men and women share this feeling too.

Comparison of San Francisco Speech

PM0606092990

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 6 June 1990 carries in its Second Edition on pages 1,6 a TASS report of a meeting between USSR President M.S. Gorbachev and U.S. businessmen 5 June in San Francisco. Comparison of the PRAVDA item, entitled "Through Trust to Cooperation," with the translation of the Moscow TASS International Russian version published in the 6 June Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, pages 14-17, reveals the following variations:

Page 14, column two, paragraph one reads: Problems of security, trust, and partnership, and the deep transformations in the USSR predominated at the meeting that took place here between USSR President M.S. Gorbachev and representatives of major industrial, commercial, and financial companies, and eminent politicians of the U.S. Pacific Coast. (rewording)

Page 16, column one, paragraph three, last sentence reads: This theme was present in our conversations with the President with the participation of the foreign ministers, and with the participation of deputy premier of the government Comrade Maslyukov whom is also co-chairman of the Soviet-U.S. commission. (adding title)

Page 16, column two, paragraph six, sentence three reads: That is the sort of thing that is being said in our country. (rewording)

Page 16, column two, paragraph seven, first sentence reads: We have drawn closer to the rest of the world. People are understanding us better and making more correct assessments about us—including in the United States. (rewording)

Comparison of Comments After Camp David

PM0406120190

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 4 June 1990 carries in its Second Edition on page 1 an undated interview with USSR President M.S. Gorbachev on USSR Central Television by an unnamed correspondent. Comparison of the PRAVDA item, entitled "M.S. Gorbachev Interview," with the translation of the Moscow Television Russian version published in the 5 June Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, pages 14-16, reveals the following variations:

Page 14, column two, second full paragraph, first sentence reads: [Correspondent] Mikhail Sergeyevich, mindful of the fact that our conversation is taking place immediately after your conversations with the U.S. President at Camp David—which evoked tremendous interest and a mass of conjectures—could you not speak about the meetings at Camp David, albeit in brief?

[Gorbachev] What has taken place at Camp David is what I would call a great day, which in its results and in what was discussed there—and moreover discussed thoroughly and comprehensively - is not inferior to what was done in the days beffore, to what has been implemented, or to what has found an expression in the agreements that have been signed. (rewording)

Page 15, column one, paragrph four, second sentence reads: I do not want to anticipate what I will say tomorrow, but nonetheless I would like to try to say a few words about the main points. The main thing is that the meeting has taken place and has been a success, and real results have been achieved. (deleting sentence)

Page 15, column one, paragraph four, sentence six reads: When we were signing the documents, I said that if it had not been for Malta, the very substantive dialogue, and the first such personal contact between the two leaders, although Mr. Bush and I had met previously, I think it would have been more difficult for us to live through these months since November and December, as they've been full of dramatic changes. (rewording)

Page 15, column one, paragraph four, sentence eight reads: So now, this factor of interaction in the context of the deep changes that are taking place in the world, when we all want our hopes to be justified—hopes of a better world and greater stability in international relations, of cooperation, that the process of disarmament will gather strength and bear fruit, and that resources will be released for solving social problems, which would improve people's lives. If we then regard this meeting from that point of view, I see that its result is precisely that it imparts stability to those positve processes of changes in international politics. (rewording)

Page 15, column two, first full paragraph, last sentence reads: What were things really like in the course of the talks?

[Gorbachev] We in our country have now reached a point, have entered a stage and phrase of the development of restructuring, in which we are now genuinely tackling what are perhaps the most important and fundamental tasks. (rewording)

Page 15, column two, paragraph two, sentence six reads: After all, we are making a shift in the direction of the market. And all this will change very seriously the position of our people, our production collectives, and the whole of society. For quite understandable reasons—after all, it affects our fate, and that of our children and grandchildren—we all are discussing all these matters in a very impassioned and sharp manner. (rewording)

Page 15, column two, third paragaph, sentence three reads: I think we must go through that, since we've decided that we can't live like this, that is's impossible to live like this any longer. I believe that we must change everything for the better, so that our people have a sense of well-being in their country, we must pass through that with courage, tackle it responsibly, and not fall into extremes. (rewording)

Page 15, column two, paragrph three, sentence nine reads: I think it is being more—more and more—understood that this is the main thing now; not meetings, and noise, and declarations, and promises, but realizing this policy of ours. I'm saying all this because we and those who act know the whole of society better, see it all, and are anxious and worried. However, our events are also of significance to the whole world. What is happening in our country does, of course, affect us above all. But at the same time the whole country and the whole of our society are turning about, as it were, and becoming open to the whole world. I did not feel myself to be in a difficult position. I know who I represent and what country I represent, and I know our possibilities. (rewording, omitting passages)

Page 16, column one, third full paragraph, sentence one reads: Everything took place in a very good atmosphere. This is, perhaps, the first time—and there have already, all the same, been many meetings with U.S. leaders—that I have been able to discuss all the problems so profoundly and thoroughly. (rewording)

Page 16, column one, fifth full paragraph, last sentence reads: I therefore think that the days ahead will add impressions and that there will be other chancces to share them later on and to tell our people about this trip in general once I return. (omitting last four paragraphs)

Soviet-U.S. UN Association Talks End

LD0706092890 Moscow TASS in English 0914 GMT 7 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 7 TASS—The successful Soviet-U.S. summit and agreements reached in Washington open up broad vistas for business cooperation between the two countries, representatives of the Soviet and U.S.

United Nations associations stressed at their meeting, which ended here on Wednesday.

They discussed the direction of United Nations activities in the economic sphere during the 1990s and elaborated their proposals and recommendations.

Scientists and politicians, maintaining a constructive unofficial dialogue, agreed that the current discussion of international economic cooperation within the UN framework fully reflects the new character of relations between countries with differing social systems.

The internationalisation of the world community's approaches to global and regional economic problems is very important, participants stressed.

The Soviet and U.S. scientists' round table is a practical response to the demands of the times: The cold war has finally ended, the world is moving from confrontation to dialogue and from an economic blockade to economic detente.

They discussed specific conditions for Soviet participation in major economic organisations' work, focusing on Soviet perestroika's influence on economic contacts between countries, ways to train Soviet staff in international management and measures to help the Soviet Union acquire full membership in these organisations.

Working out approaches to resolve global problems, the two sides spoke of the need to introduce organisational changes in the United Nations in order to develop effective social and economic strategy acceptable to all the international community.

Nikitin-Led Delegation Ends U.S. Visit

LD0706085190 Moscow TASS in English 0802 GMT 7 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Nikolay Orekhov]

[Text] Washington June 7 TASS—A Soviet delegation, led by Vladilen Nikitin, first deputy prime minister of the USSR, has completed its stay in the USA. The delegation consisted of people's deputies from the USSR and Union republics, the heads of a number of ministries and departments, representatives of engineering branches and the agro-industrial sector.

The delegation attended a three-day international conference on the food industry, meeting representatives of 85 engineering and processing firms.

Participants in the conference approved of the accords reached between Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and U.S. President George Bush during the summit in Washington and took particular interest in ideas that Gorbachev put forward during his meetings with U.S. businessmen in Minneapolis and San Francisco.

Specific ways to broaden and deepen Soviet-American cooperation in the field of agriculture and in various sectors of agro-industrial production were mapped out during the delegation's meetings in Washington.

Prospects for wider contacts through government organisations and between private American firms and Soviet enterprises were discussed. The meetings revealed the desire of the two sides to start joint work in the near future.

The Soviet delegation's stay in Washington ended with the signing of an inter-governmental agreement on the two countries' cooperation in the food industry.

Parliamentary Delegation Continues Canada Visit

Meet Committee Members

LD0606142690 Moscow TASS in English 1353 GMT 6 Jun 90

[By TASS special correspondent Sergey Kuznetsov]

[Text] Ottawa June 6 TASS—A delegation from the USSR Supreme Soviet, led by chairman of the Council of Nationalities Rafik Nishanov, continues its official visit to Canada at the invitation of the Canadian federal legislature. On Tuesday members of the delegation met heads of several major committees of the parliament here.

During the meeting the Soviet delegation talked with members of the House of Commons' committee on multiculturalism and citizenship and on aboriginal affairs.

The MP's discussed ways of state development and ensuring the rights of ethnic minorities.

During the talks it was stressed that the USSR and Canada have much in common due to their multinational nature and federal set-up. It would be mutually beneficial for the two countries to share relevant expertise. Both sides expressed their desire to establish a regular exchange of views on these issues.

Soviet deputies took part in a meeting of the House of Commons' Standing Committee on External Affairs and International Trade, discussing Germany's unification. The Canadian side favoured including a united Germany into NATO, which it said must be reoriented from military to political activity.

The Soviet deputies pointed out Soviet proposals to demilitarise Germany and ensure security by replacing the system of military blocs with new structures of collective security.

The Soviet delegation met members of the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee and familiarised themselves with the structure and distinctive features of this chamber of the Canadian parliament, its role in the legislative process.

Soviet deputies met leaders of the Canadian Senate, led by its speaker Guy Charbonneau. The Canadian side

stressed its wish to promote perestroyka in the USSR. The Senate leadership expressed readiness to promote the development of comprehensive Soviet-Canadian relations, which received fresh impetus from the recent state visit by the Soviet president.

"We hope that our western partners will render assistance to the planned transition of the USSR to a regulated market-based economy," Nishanov said. "If all trade barriers and limitations on the sale of high technology are removed, the Soviet Union could move much faster in this direction."

Meets Governor General

LD0706133790 Moscow TASS in English 1018 GMT 7 Jun 90

[Text] Ottawa June 7 TASS—A delegation from the USSR Supreme Soviet continues its official visit in Canada at the invitation of the Canadian Parliament.

On Wednesday head of the delegation, chairman of the Council of Nationalities Rafik Nishanov was received by Canada's Governor-General Ramon Hnatyshyn, who represents British Queen Elizabeth the Second and exercises the executive power vested in the British monarch.

During a conversation that was sincere and cordial, Hnatyshyn highly appraised the recent state visit to Canada by Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev.

The governor-general noted that meetings and negotiations during the Soviet president's stay in Ottawa had become an important landmark in Soviet-Canadian relations and would undoubtedly promote their development.

It was emphasised that parliamentary ties are an indispensible element of Soviet-Canadian cooperation.

The governor-general confirmed Canada's interest in the success of Soviet perestroyka and its readiness to support perestroyka by developing mutually-advantageous commercial and economic relations.

He expressed understanding for the difficulties that the Soviet Union encounters in dealing with inter-ethnic problems and noted their similarity with Canada's problems.

Nishanov expressed gratitude for the hospitality accorded to the Soviet parliamentarians in Canada and emphasised the Soviet people's sincere desire to consolidate the good-neighbourly relations and various contacts between the two countries.

Soviet parliamentarians visited the Canadian parliament and were present at a meeting of the House of Commons. Applause broke out when the speaker announced tha the Soviet delegation was present in the hall.

On the same day the delegation met leaders of the Canadian group of the Inter-Parliamentary Union. The two sides discussed ways to expand international ties.

Soviet parliamentarians visited Canada's Supreme Court and described Soviet legal reform to its staffers. Chief Justice of Canada Bertha Wilson described to the delegation the structure of Canada's judiciary bodies, the composition of the Supreme Court and its main directions of activity.

The members [words indistinct] today.

Return From Canada

PM1106152790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading: "Official Announcements"]

[Text] A USSR Supreme Soviet delegation headed by R.N. Nishanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities, returned from Canada 9 June. It was paying an official visit to that country at the invitation of the Canadian parliament.

Canadian Firm Signs Agreement on Packaging Plant

PM0706182890 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Report by IZVESTIYA correspondents G. Charodeyev and M. Yusin, incorporating interview with R. Hoffmann, president of Canada's Hoffman Developments company, in Moscow; date not specified: "Debut in the Soviet Market"]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] Evidence of the establishment of economic ties between the USSR and Canada was provided by the signing in Moscow of a major new joint project. The well-known Canadian firm Hoffmann Developments has decided to pool its efforts with Soviet partners to build a plant for the production of packaging film, which we are so short of in our country. [passage omitted]

[Hoffmann] The firm's investments in fixed capital will total more than $1 million. We are prepared to invest another 5 million in packaging lines. We plan to buy unique equipment and scarce materials from abroad. We expect a profit in not less than five or six years, when ww will be able to sell some of the output produced in the Soviet Union advantageously abroad.

In the next few years the firm plans to make its profits mainly from the construction of new buildings in Moscow and the modernization of old ones. It is well known that the city is short of well-appointed premises for the offices and missions of foreign firms. I think Hoffmann Developments, which has considerable experience in this sphere, will be able to bring great benefit to its Soviet partners. [passage omitted]

China

Liu Huaqing Continues Official Moscow Visit

Visits Space Flight Center

OW1106124190 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0200 GMT 6 Jun 90

[Text] Lieutenant General Liu Huaqing, vice chairman of China's Central Military Commission, continues his official visit in Moscow. On 4 June he visited the newly established Gagarin Space Training Center in the vicinity of Moscow, welcomed by the center's leadership and cosmonauts.

The Chinese guests of honor were first briefed by Comrade (Litvov) on the Soviet space station Mir, in which Solovyev and Balandin are making a space flight.

(Litvov) told the guests that these controls are an accurate model of those of the Mir space station in flight. He described in detail the characteristics of the space station and the working and living conditions of the cosmonauts, as well as the work they do there. After that, Liu Huaqing inspected the internal structure of the Mir space station.

[Begin recording] [Unidentified speaker] What do you think?

[Liu Huaqing] Very good. (?I flew about 30 minutes in it.) [laughter] [end recording]

While visiting the new space training center, by chance they met two Japanese, who are here for training in preparation for a joint Soviet-Japanese flight.

The Chinese guests noticed a female Japanese reporter. She is one of Japan's cosmonaut candidates. After keen competition, she has been selected to participate in training in preparation for a space flight. The joint space flight plan will be carried out on 3 December this year.

Referring to the possibility of future Chinese cosmonauts being trained here, Kulikov, one of the leaders of the center, said: We have trained 15 foreigners who have flown in our spacecraft. Austrian, British, and Japanese cosmonauts are undergoing training here in preparation for a space flight. If Chinese want to come, we will welcome them and will see to it that their flight training will reach a very high standard.

Liu Huaqing did not deny such a possibility. Bidding farewell to the cosmonauts, he said:

[Begin Liu Huaqing recording] (?I hope I will be) able to meet Chinese cosmonauts here. [words indistinct] Thank you. [end recording]

Meets With Zaykov

LD1106171190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1554 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, 11 June, (TASS)—A meeting took place today between Lev Zaykov, CPSU Central Committee secretary and Politburo member, Liu Huaqing, vice chairman of the Central Military Commission of the Chinese Communist Party Central Committee, who is leading a Chinese delegation in the USSR.

In the course of a friendly conversation, the sides exchanged information and opinions on the topical issues of perestroyka in the Soviet Union and reforms in the PRC. The importance of further stable development of Soviet-Chinese cooperation in all spheres on the basis of universal principles of intercourse between states has been underlined, which meets the fundamental interests of the peoples of the two countries, and facilitates radical improvement of the situation in the world.

A mutually useful conversation on the problems linked to the transfer of military industries in the USSR and in PRC to civilian production in order to satisfy the necessities of life of the population, has taken place.

Tiananmen Anniversary Marked by Uneasy Calm

No 'Bloodshed' Planned

WA0706185790 Moscow TRUD in Russian 5 Jun 90 p 3

[Correspondent A. Sukhotin report: "Tiananmen: Sleeping Volcano?"]

[Text] Beijing, 4 June—"Big demonstrations are not expected, and the police will cope with small ones. Some things have been learned from last year's experience—we hope on this occasion to get by without bloodshed...." This was approximately how the majority of Chinese with whom I spoke on the threshold of the anniversary of the events at Tiananmen expressed themselves when rumors were making the rounds of Beijing concerning student preparations for new demonstrations and protest actions.

Some people believed even these fears to be exaggerated; what could happen when the temperature on the street is 30 degrees centigrade, it is unbearably stuffy, and it is as if the city is immersed in a lethargic sleep?

Nonetheless, the call for stability has, as before, been predominant in the official press, the speeches of local politicians, and the endless meetings, gatherings, "drills," and conferences.

"We must preserve stability as we would our lives," RENMIN RIBAO, organ of the CCP Central Committee, emphasized in today's commentary, which was reprinted by the other central publications. "The purpose of last year's storm organized by hostile forces

within the country and overseas was to oust the leadership of the CCP, undermine the socialist system of the country, and make it an appendage of the developed capitalist countries," it reminded people.

Without going into specifics on this proposition, the people with whom I spoke observed at the same time that the center of the problem has shifted to a different plane—ethical aspects of the use of military force in resolving last year's conflict. Not everyone shares the official version to the effect that no other choice remained.

It is for this reason, evidently, that the authorities have deemed it necessary to demonstrate yet again a readiness to employ the most decisive measures in the event of any repetition of last year's demonstrations, up to and including the army deployed in the capital's suburbs. Ringed by guards, empty Tiananmen has at this time come under the administration of the police. Representatives of all branches thereof—in uniform and plain clothes, armed and unarmed, on foot and in various forms of transport, patrolling, standing, commanding, observing—have put the center of the city and the main traffic islands and highways under tight supervision.

As a whole, foreign observers maintain, everything has so far managed to sort itself out, not counting petty incidents in the area of the square and a nighttime mass meeting of several hundred students at Beijing University, which are not considered all that significant.

"There is a saying in China that a prudent person concerns himself first with his own safety," participants in last year's student demonstrations say. "It is a shame that many of us learned too late that we had become pawns in another's game. The disenchantment is infinite. And the majority has no desire to repeat last year's mistakes...."

The bitter words are an explanation for the relative calm in the capital on the anniversary of the tragic events. Is this not calm like a sleeping volcano whose awakening could be unpredictable? This question, which was raised a year ago by the trade union paper GONGREN RIBAO, remains pertinent.

Conditions Unripe for Democracy

OW0906175390 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0100 GMT 5 Jun 90

[IZVESTIYA article on anniversary of Tiananmen incident; from the "Current Events and Commentaries" program]

[Text] IZVESTIYA published an article by its Beijing-based reporter (Shavenkov) marking the anniversary of the Tiananmen incident. The article reads as follows:

The central square of Beijing was closed to open traffic for several days. Security measures were stepped up in Beijing. Troops were deployed in areas surrounding the capital. There were more armed police patrols. At the end of spring and in the beginning of summer last year, the situation in Beijing deteriorated to such an extent that troops attacked peaceful residents. Tragedy occurred on a Sunday when hundreds of residents were killed. What was the cause of the action that led to tragic bloodshed?

The reform that had been carried out in China for more than 10 years after years of suffering and stagnation brought hopes, freedom of thought, bumper harvests, and welfare for China. However, problems cropped up later on. The most serious of them all were inflation, increases in commodity prices, and the stagnation of agricultural development. As a result, the living standard in a number of social strata began to decline. Political reform [words indistinct] delayed. The people took to the streets in April 1989. Demonstrators demanded a high degree of democratization and freedom of the press and voiced opposition against graft, embezzlement, bribe taking, and [words indistinct]. At this juncture, reporters, staff members, and workers gave support to the students. Demonstrators made several attempts at conducting dialogue with the government. However, neither side was willing to compromise. Demonstrations were purely peaceful in nature; there were no signs of arrogance or aggression whatsoever. However, some people could not refrain from saying that the turmoil must be stopped and that it caused too many losses for the state. There were also some other people who spread rumors to make the situation deteriorate and took advantage of the opportunity to attack the socialist system and the Communist Party. At this juncture, the view that the republic was facing a threat gained an upper hand among the leading group. Martial law was declared.

IZVESTIYA reporter (Shavenkov) continues his article as follows:

The situation deteriorated to tragic consequences in the evening of 3 June and in the early hours of 4 June. The troops began to attack. From the upstairs of the many storied building in which I lived I saw the people of Beijing surrounding trucks and trying to dissuade soldiers from moving forward and advancing toward the square with all the streets leading to it occupied by students. Their attempts and efforts proved futile in the end. Dialogue was interrupted. Guns were fired and tanks made way for soldiers.

A tendency toward a tougher political and ideological stand and a more aggressive attitude appeared in the wake of last year's incident. The media of public opinion focused on reports of the postive materials; criticisms were regarded as being of secondary importance. Some people in China said that democracy is not something that is abstract and that it is related to history, the social system, and the level of economic and cultural development. An official conclusion was that conditions for China to [words indistinct] democracy are not yet ripe, as it will disrupt social stability. Here it stressed unified

thinking and viewpoints and remained unchanged in its attitude toward last year's tragic incident.

USSR, PRC Examine Asian-Pacific Ocean

LD1206022990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1705 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] Beijing 11 June (TASS)—Within the framework of the protocol on consultations between the USSR and PRC foreign ministries, Soviet-Chinese consultations on the problems of the Asian-Pacific Ocean region have been held in Beijing. The sides exchanged views concerning the general situation in this region, its military-political and economic aspects, including ways to lessen tension in the Korean peninsula.

An accord has been reached to hold regular Soviet-Chinese consultations on the Asian-Pacific Ocean problems.

Near East & South Asia

Soviet-U.S. Summit Seeks Afghan Settlement

LD1106141790 Moscow TASS in English 1414 GMT 11 Jun 90

[by TASS political news analyst Askold Biryukov]

[Text] Moscow June 11 TASS—Has the recent Soviet-American summit contributed in some way to a political settlement in Afghanistan? There is no one answer to this question.

The summit continued to search for common ground in the yet differing positions of the two sides.

Summing up the results of his negotiations with the Soviet foriegn minister, U.S. Secretary of State James Baker told a news conference in Moscow that the two parties were closer to a common basis that would enable them to move towards fair and free elections—the best way for reconciliation in Afghanistan.

Back to Wyoming, the two parties worked out a common approach to facilitate resolving regional problems around the world based on transition from rivalry to cooperation and interaction.

They reaffirmed that their vigorous support of political decisions—all-inclusive and resting on broad national reconciliation—will help facilitate a peaceful solution to regional conflicts.

Afghan President Najibullah was the first to advance the idea of holding elections in Afghanistan, during the Belgrade non-aligned summit.

Washington officials now agree with Moscow and Kabul that a transition period is needed to conduct an inter-Afghan dialogue and create the mechanism to form a government on a broad basis.

It may be due to Washington's new approach that Afghan militants launched a campaign of threats and crude violence against Western, including American humanitarian organisations that provide assistance to Afghan refugees in Pakistan and against the population of Afghan provinces controlled by the armed opposition.

Both sides, THE NEW YORK TIMES reported the other day, quoting U.S. Administration officials, seem to have moved closer to an agreement on Afghanistan, even though serious differences remain.

The issue of who will head the Kabul government during the transition period prior to elections remains central to the two countries' positions, the newspaper said.

Washington officials state they support the Afghan opposition's demands that Najibullah resign. But this stance is both unrealistic and illogical.

Is it serious that the head of a regime that proved its viability should resign? And another question: Precisely what opposition does Washington support?

One canot say that a monolith force is operating in Afghanistan today, forming an alternative to the governing regime. The opposition to the Kabul government is not only disunited, but is also in a state of ruthless rivalry, with civilians and refugees often becoming its victims.

Indeed, there are still differences between the positions of the two superpowers, but advancement on some aspects of the political settlement is encouraging. Today the remaining differences must be persistently eliminated and ways found for rapprochement in the spirit of realism and cooperation.

Afghan Border Situation Continues To Deteriorate

LD1106132690 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] Reports from the Soviet-Afghan border often cause worries. Radio Moscow's Valeriy Chebotarev, fresh from the border, will be reporting on the situation until next Friday. First, Major General (Boris Agapov) of the Central Asian border district. He had this to say in an interview: The situation on the border has been complicated ever since this country withdrew troops from Afghanistan. Mind you, Afghan Government troops and the armed opposition have been fighting on the Soviet border. Strikes are delivered by artillery and aviation and both small and heavy arms are used.

The mining of Soviet territory has continued to date. Smuggling has grown rampant and there have been attempts to push large consignments of drugs into this country.

General (Agapov) spoke of the Soviet troops involved in clashes on the border. The troops often have to enter into combat attempts of that kind, especially to stand up to weapons smugglers. As soon as border guards shout stop,

and shoot in the air, grenades are thrown at them. Two Soviet local residents found themselves in a situation like this last year. They chanced into smugglers after breaking border rules and crossing a guarded region. The smugglers threw three grenades at them at once injuring both.

There were four armed clashes between border guards and smugglers in the Termez section last year alone. The guards always emerged victorious. They inflicted losses on smugglers but were injured themselves, too. On prospects for the situation on the Soviet-Afghan border General (Agapov) referred to Afghan border guards: We feel the situation will change for the worse shortly. [sentence as heard] We hope the fratricidal war in Afghanistan will end and peace will come about. That is the only hope we have. We on the border will feel quieter then.

MiG-21 Crashes Into Kabul Building 10 Jun

LD1006093790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0855 GMT 10 Jun 90

[Report by TASS correspondents Petr Kostromin and Andrey Semenov]

[Text] Kabul, 10 Jun (TASS)—We have just witnessed an Afghan Air Force plane crashing in the old quarter of Kabul. One of a pair of MiG-21 fighters that were flying over the city suddenly left the formation and, having rapidly lost altitude, fell onto the roof of a five-story building. The pilot managed to eject.

The plane broke through the building's two upper floors. The force of the explosion hurled a part of the aircraft 300 meters. Fires broke out and the fighter's ordnance load began to explode, scattering dozens of burning magnetic traps used by aircraft as decoys against ground-to-air missiles. There was a fire risk to adjacent buildings. Kabul firemen reacted promptly and efficiently—a few minutes after the crash their crews arrived and began fighting the fire.

So far there is no information about casualties, nor are the circumstances of the crash clear.

Lebanese Leader on Baghdad, U.S.-Soviet Summits

LD1006165990

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1345 GMT on 10 June carries a 10-minute interview with Lebanese President Ilyas al-Hirawi by political observer F. Seyful-Mulyukov on the "Topical Interview" program. The date and place of the interview are not given. The interview is conducted in Arabic with superimposed Russian translation.

Seyful-Mulyukov asks Al-Hirawi how he will use his position to end the bloodshed in Lebanon. Al-Hirawi wants to "overcome barriers of discord" by "restoring legality and constitutional institutions." A national consensus will help us to turn the tragic page in our contemporary history and to start renewing the pan-Lebanese home," says al-Hirawi.

Next Mulyukov asks for an assessment of the present political situation in the country. Al-Hirawai says that "unfortunately, the tragedy in Lebanon is continuing, witnessed by internecine strife, first in eastern, and now in western Beirut, and in other regions of the country, such as certain regions of southern Lebanon, which are occupied as before by Israeli troops." The video, which has been showing Mulyukov interviewing al-Hirawi across a desk, switches to footage of bombed street scenes taken from a Mercedes. The video reverts to al-Hirawi behind his desk, as he calls for an end to foreign intervention in Lebanon and appeals to all Lebanese to aid the consolidation of unity in the name of the national salvation of Lebanon.

Mulyukov asks Al-Hirawi whether it is possible to put the agreements reached last year in Saudi Arabia into practice? Al-Hirawi says that he has sworn on the constitution that he will do everything in his power to achieve this, and thinks that it is the only way of settling the Lebanese crisis.

Mulyukov reminds the president that he did not participate in the recent Arab summit in Baghdad, when the Lebanese issue was discussed. He asks whether al-Hirawi agrees with the decisions made in Baghdad. Al-Hirawi says that the Baghdad summit supported the Saudi Arabian agreements on Lebanon and adopted a decision to assist the legitimate Lebanese authorities. This support must aid the situation in Lebanon.

This question is followed by one on the interrelations between the Lebanese situation and the Middle East conflict with a video of Arab women with crates on their heads and babies walking past sandbags and washing hanging on a line. Al-Hirawi replies that Lebanon is an integral part of the Middle East. The Lebanese and Palestinians living in Lebanon are identical victims of internecine strife and foreign intervention.

Mulyukov asks for the president's view on the role of the "great" powers in a Lebanese settlement. The president is sincerely grateful to all who aspire to help Lebanon. He says: "I must say that we highly value the friendly position of the Soviet Union, which is pursuing the course of the peaceful resolution of regional conflicts, and advocates the quickest possible settlement of the Lebanese problem."

Mulyukov: "And the last question: How do you assess the recent Soviet-U.S. summit?"

Al-Hirawi: "We paid particular attention to how the two presidents discussed regional problems, and, in particular, the Middle East problem. Much depends on the positions and interaction of the two superpowers, including developments in the situation in our region. We cannot fail to note that U.S. policy in the Middle

East, if we assess its essence, is above all oriented toward the support of Israel's interests. As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, at the Washington summit President Gorbachev expressed a frank and clearly-defined position on the issue of a settlement in the Middle East. It remains for us to wait and see what influence the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit will have on the future course of events in the Middle East region and on the resolution of its acute and explosive problems."

Jibril Warns of Plans To Attack Soviet Jews

LD1106124290 Moscow TASS in English 1224 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] London June 11 TASS—General Secretary of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine—General Command (PFLP-GC) Ahmad Jibril warned that his organisation was planning to attack Jewish immigrants from the Soviet Union, THE INDEPENDENT ON SUNDAY newspaper reports.

Jibril said that if the United States continued its financial and other aid to Israel, thereby helping immigration, "we shall use every means at our disposal, including armed struggle, to halt the process".

The newspaper notes that the Israeli military intelligence chief had warned a few days ago that Palestinians may use terrorism against Jewish immigrants from the USSR both in Israel and beyond its borders.

East Europe

Gorbachev Greets Hungary's Horn on Party Post

LD1106153490 Moscow TASS in English 1519 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 11 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev congratulated Gyula Horn on his election as chairman of the Hungarian Socialist Party and expressed the interest of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in the fruitful development of links with the Hungarian Socialist Party for the benefit of the Soviet and Hungarian peoples.

Aboimov Comments on Pact, Ties With Hungary

LD1106201990 Budapest MTI in English 1943 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, June 11 (MTI)—The session of the Warsaw Treaty Political Consultative Committee, held in Moscow last week, was favourably evaluated not only in the member states, but also in the west. The prophecies, which spoke of the collapse of the organization in the near future, did not prove true, said Ivan Aboimov.

The Soviet deputy foreign minister, who also acted as the general secretary of the Political Consultative Committee [PCC] in the past year, received MTI's Moscow correspondent on the occasion of his leaving for Budapest on Tuesday. Mr. Aboimov is to become the Soviet ambassador to Hungary.

Mr. Aboimov's activity as general secretary of the PCC coincided with the period that saw the emergence of the active process of change from a military-political alliance into a political-military alliance. "Last week's conference laid down new foundations along the road leading to the target set. The political nature and elements of cooperation should be more dynamically intersified in our alliance in the future", he said.

Stressing his personal views, Mr. Aboimov said the Warsaw Treaty played an extremely positive role in the past years in the advancement of the disarmament processes and talks. His conviction is that the organization will play an active role in the coming years in the pan-European processes, in the creation of the continent's collective security system.

Discussing his conceptions as ambassador to Budapest, and the Hungarian-Soviet relations, Mr. Aboimov said:

"There's much to be done so that our relation develop in the spirit of mutual respect, sovereignty, equality and good-neighbourliness. According to my knowledge, the new Hungarian Government and Parliament also profess similar views. The many problems accumulated over the years can be solved with joint goodwill, and respect for the interests of one another."

MSZMP Secretary Visits International Department

PM1106115390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Jun 90 Second Edition p 7

[TASS report under the general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] L. Udvarhelyi, secretary of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party [MSZMP], was in Moscow on 8 June. Questions of cooperation between the two parties were discussed during talks which he had at the CPSU Central Committee International Department.

West Europe

FRG's Genscher Calls for More Trust in Europe

LD0806115390 Moscow TASS in English 1121 GMT 8 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Abrosimov]

[Text] Bonn June 8 TASS—"One of the principle tasks today is to promote qualitatively new relations between the Western and Eastern alliances. It is necessary to build new foundations for trust between us," West German Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher stressed in an interivew with the "Deutschlandfunk" broadcasting station.. He believes ideological contradictions, causing confrontation between the two alliances, were now things of the past.

"I think it would be better for everybody if the alliances would jointly get down to the building of bridges of confidence and would regard themselves as entities contributing to arms control, disarmament and formation of cooperative security structures in Europe," Genscher noted. He also said that such an approach would help deepen the CSCE process.

"The forthcoming CSCE summit in Helsinki must add new quality to this process," Genscher said. "The point in question is to set up permanent insitutions and to hold regular meetings between heads of state and government, as well as foreign ministers. Thereby, the CSCE process would create 'stability frameworks' for Europe's development in which the Soviet Union must go on playing an important role. Reduction of conventional armaments, covering not only the armaments of the great powers, but also the armed forces of other states, including a future united Germany, will be another factor of promoting this development. Recognition of the western Polish border is very important. All this allows us to claim that basic elements of the European structure have appeared, making possible the reunification of the two German states," Genscher stressed.

Genscher believes that 1990 offers European politics a chance to make remarkable progress, comparable only to last year's radical reforms on the continent. In the final analysis, they would have been impossible without the policy pursued by Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev," Genscher noted.

Interviewed on Reunification

PM0806114590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Jun 90 Second Edition p 5

[Report by own correspondent Yevgeniy Grigoryev: "His Watchword Is Energy and Constancy; Account of leader of the FRG Foreign Policy Department"]

[Excerpts] Bonn, June—He likes historical novels and classical music. He collects caricatures of himself (he says they help him know himself) and elephant figurines, believing that they look like him—"their ears, feelings, and memory..."—and that they bring good luck.

His life has been devoted to politics, which has become his main profession. And to all appearances he is satisfied with how his life has taken shape. Good luck symbols have nothing to do with it, although good luck has not passed him by. But he sees the main reason in character traits of which he speaks like a true German:

"Energy and constancy... I have achieved everything with grave difficulty..."

And so, Hans-Dietrich Genscher. FRG vice chancellor and foreign minister. Politician and statesman. In his own country only babies do not know him. Statisticians have lost count of the countries he has visited and the hundreds of thousands of kilometers he has traveled. He has had various missions. Their content has changed too. Today the German question has come on the agenda of European and international politics. Naturally, the head of the foreign policy department is now busy primarily with the complex problems on which the process of German unification depends. He represents the FRG in the "two plus four" group which was formed from the foreign ministers of the USSR, the United States, France, Britain, and both German states to resolve the foreign aspects of building German unity, including questions of security.

Actually, in Bonn's Germany policy as a whole, in whose field Chancellor H. Kohl massively dominates, Genscher also plays one of the first fiddles. Is there any need to prove that as politicians of this scale acquire increasing responsibility at a crucial stage of postwar European and German history, he is again in the central field of public interest. Incidentally, there is already a "Genscher plan," as the press calls it. Its main idea is that a united Germany should belong to NATO but that the sphere of activity of this military organization, including the bundeswehr, will not extend to the present territory of the GDR, where Soviet troops can remain for the time being.

This is perhaps one of the German questions which he diplomatically avoids when the question arises in our conversation. The topic is indeed a delicate one. As is well known, the Soviet Union objects to the future Germany's military-political status on a NATO basis and Moscow has weighty grounds for this. According to the principle of "contrariness" the minister turns to the idea of neutralizing Germany. In his view it would be a step backward. It is better, he argues, that a country in the center of the continent and with a population of 75 million and a powerful economic potential should not be neutral and stray around Europe but should drop anchor in the Western alliance, which in turn would not be in constant confrontation with the Warsaw Pact.

Frankly, I remain unclear as to why Germany should "stray" when, as my interlocutor said, absolutely new conditions of international existence are arising in Europe. The alliances are switching from confrontation toward cooperation. Cooperative security structures are arising. Genscher stresses that German unification should be included in the European context. He is obviously seeking in it primarily the key to the dilemmas and problems of the external aspects of German-German unification. But about that below.

[Excerpts] Usually politicians, and indeed our brother journalists, are not averse to expatiating in the abstract on the challenge of the era and the requirements of the times. In the FRG responsible figures have been faced with this test. It is making greater demands than ever on qualities like realism, circumspection, good will, and the ability and readiness to consider the interests of others. After all after two world wars and one "cold" war the forthcoming emergence of a united Germany is seen by the peoples not simply as a change in the register of European states. And there are many and varied fears.

Partly unjustified. But they are a reality. Especially as some people here, too, have committed acts of folly in the "reunification" euphoria.

Hans-Dietrich Genscher belongs to those Bonn circles which understand this. According to him unification should proceed in such a way as to be a gain for Europe and a contribution to European stability and cooperation. On the fundamental question of borders he has not stopped at openly disagreeing with the chancellor. He insists that the definitive nature of the Western border in Poland along the Oder and Neisse is a fundamental condition for peace in Europe and for German unification. [passage omitted]

[Genscher] In a mutually dependent world the conduct of one cannot but influence the conduct of another. When the USSR decided to deploy its SS-20 missiles I considered it a big mistake, and I said so to the then Soviet leadership, and we reacted by arms upgrading. When the Soviet Union, within the framework of the policy of reforms, made changes to its domestic and foreign policy, this cannot and should not remain without impact on the West's policy. And consequently our policy, as part of the policy of the Western alliance and the EC. That is why I answer in the affirmative the question about the positive influence of perestroyka on our policy."

The minister interprets the change which has taken place as the USSR having abandoned its previous expansionist policy and steered a course toward cooperation and stability. There arises here a fundamental coincidence of views since the FRG also wants stability, disarmament, and the overcoming of what divides Europe.

"Initially the Helsinki process, which I have always supported," he continues, "made possible the joint life, so to speak, of two Europes. Now, with the preparation of a new all-European summit meeting, it is a case of laying the foundations for a single, integral Europe. As I understand it, that is also the Soviet Union's view."

Stop. It is time to turn over the tape recorder cassette. However much we used to engage in propaganda "war" with Genscher, he is with us. We dragged out quotations, necessarily using flattering ones more rarely than pejorative ones. What could be better than the new times of openness, mutual respect, and dialogue? Surely it is no bad thing that many of Genscher's ideas are close to or coincide with ours? And he himself can no longer be accused of "Genscherism" although it does happen that a stone is cast from the extreme right flank of the Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union or the "union of exiles." Well, the journalist is faced with the problem of not making his interlocutor an angel in the flesh. [passage omitted]

In the opinion of a subtle observer like G. Andreotti recorded in the biographical anthology about Genscher, the latter has an inherent trust of thought, reason, and dialogue, as the only suitable instrument for resolving difficult and sometimes seemingly insoluble problems of international politics. But the author also stresses the man's renowned "feeling." Well, it is indeed inherent in him.

It looks as though the present upheaval of events in Europe confirms this. An unusual time changes not only policy but also politicians. An attraction toward conceptual thinking, especially on European questions, can now often be noted in Genscher.

"German reunification should not lead to shifts in the correlation of forces in Europe," he says. "But the concept of Europe needs to be rethought. We must think not of East and West Europe but of the structures of a single Europe. That includes a united Germany. It includes the deepening of the Helsinki process and the creation of all-European institutions. For instance, we need a center for the peaceful settlement of conflicts, although it would be better to call it a center 'for safeguarding security' inasmuch as the word "conflict" has a negative ring. Then we need a center for the verification of disarmament. And an institution for regular conferences at summit and foreign minister level. We must reach agreement on external aspects and then we will be able to implement unification. In actual fact we do not intend to confront anyone with faits accomplis. Here we should avoid the danger of using the yardsticks of the past to lay rails into the future. The future should be geared toward mutual trust and mutually advantageous cooperation. That is what Gorbachev said in the United Nations and it is right..."

[Excerpts] He sees the prospect of relations between our peoples as very promising. He believes that we can give each other a very great deal and breathe new life into all the good traditions which the two sides have. The content of the 1989 joint statement signed between the USSR and the FRG could in the future acquire even greater value in its application to all Germany and to the Soviet Union.

"Surely you encounter difficulties?" I could not help asking, recalling the opposite approaches toward questions of the peace treaty, which Bonn does not want, the military-political status of the future Germany, and several other difficulties.

"No," I hear in reply.

"None at all?"

"It depends what you understand by difficulties... Of course, in the economic field considerably more could be done. I hope that the new reforms announced in your country will improve opportunities for such cooperation. But I do not rate that as a difficulty. I would say there are no conflicts," my interlocutor concludes.

Yes, this situation undoubtedly facilitates dialogue and the quest for mutually acceptable solutions. So we end our talk on an optimistic note. But whether this optimism will be justified in the future—life will show. Let us hope that it will justify itself.

Correspondents Review Importance of Brest Talks

LD1106110990 Moscow TASS in English 1059 GMT 11 Jun 90

[By TASS special correspondents Sergey Sosnovskiy, Georgiy Shmelev, and Ivan Kuksa]

[Text] Brest, Belorussia, June 11 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and his West German counterpart Hans-Dietrich Genscher started their one-day talks here today.

The talks will focus on the German issue and international implications of German unification in the context of the European process.

The talks are taking place shortly after the Soviet-Canadian and Soviet-U.S. summits, the Moscow conference of the Warsaw Pact's Political Consultative Committee and the NATO Council's session at Turnberry, Scotland, where the German issue was thoroughly discussed.

Foreign aspects of German unification rivet the attention of politicians and the world public. The solution of this problem should largely determine the nature and pace of European processes and the construction of a "European home."

Hasty decisions or a choice of only one variant are inadmissible. Intensive discussions and the search for a mutually acceptable solution are necessary.

This solution should not only satisfy all the sides. It should also strengthen and develop positive changes that are taking place in Europe and the whole world.

This solution can be reached during the inevitable transitional period through the "Two Plus Four" mechanism with the participation of all countries concerned.

The Germans' right to live in a united country is indisputable, but the Soviet people's sensitive attitude to German unification is also clear and understandable.

The Soviet people, like other nations, have a right to the final and fair summation of the results of World War II.

There is a real need for guarantees that the strategic stability in Europe will not be violated. The creation of such guarantees is closely linked with the European process, the creation of a system of stability and security, and changes in the bloc structure on the continent.

The Moscow meeting of the Warsaw Pact's Political Consultative Committee passed highly important decisions on these issues, including an agreement on profound changes in the Warsaw Pact and its transformation into a political alliance.

The Political Consultative Committee is waiting for an adequate response from the NATO summit in London, scheduled for July.

The summit's decisions will help determine areas of interaction in preparing new structures of stability and security in Europe.

Shevardnadze, Genscher Begin Talks in Brest

TASS Details Talks

LD1106192990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1835 GMT 11 Jun 90

[By TASS special correspondents Sergey Sosnovskiy, Georgiy Shmelev, and Ivan Kuksa]

[Text] Brest, 11 Jun (TASS)—A working meeting took place here today between USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and FRG Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher. It was devoted primarily to a discussion in broad terms of the external aspects of the construction of German unity, that is to say, issues included on the agenda of the "two-plus-four" talks.

Both ministers stated that the holding of their present meeting in Brest had a deeply symbolic significance, not only recalling the tragic pages in the history of relations between the two countries, but stressing their firm resolve to turn the final page on the past and open a new chapter in these relations, one free of fear and in keeping with genuine goodneighborliness and cooperation for the benefit of both sides.

In the course of a direct and frank exchange of opinions, which lasted for more than six hours, both sides expressed the conviction that a united Germany must become a force for peace and stability in Europe, and a settlement of the external aspects of the construction of German unity must move forward the all-European process and give further impetus to the favorable tendencies gathering strength on the European Continent.

In particular, in light of the decision by the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee conference that took place in Moscow, and the session of the NATO Foreign Ministers Committee that has been taking place in Scotland, considerable attention was given to a conceptual exchange of opinions on the transformation of relations between the Warsaw Pact and NATO. The Soviet side set out a number of specific considerations on this account, which in principle were received with understanding, although the detailed study of these of course will require time and consultations among the NATO allies. Having discussed the military and political status of a united Germany, the ministers expressed confidence that the positive evolution of the general situation is making the solution of this extremely complex question easier.

The ministers reviewed the problems of European politics, aiming at a summit meeting of the CSCE member-countries at the end of this year. It was noted that while the basic premises coincide on a whole range of specific issues, solutions acceptable to both sides remain to be found.

Shevardnadze and Genscher described as extremely useful contacts between the Soviet and West German sides at various levels, and confirmed their intention to continue these intensively and in a constructive spirit.

The ministers laid wreaths at the eternal flame at the Brest fortress, where bitter fighting took place in 1941 between the Soviet Army and the Hitlerite invaders.

Genscher Issues Statement

PM1106185590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Step Toward a United Europe"]

[Text] Bonn, 11 Jun—Issuing a statement in connection with his meeting with USSR Foreign Minister A.E. Shevardnadze, FRG Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher pointed to the need to deepen and develop all-European processes. He expressed confidence that it will prove possible this year to "radically change the situation on the continent and lay the foundation for the Europe of the future."

This year's coming all-European summit meeting in Paris will mark a new chapter in European history, the minister said. It is now a question of creating a united Europe within the framework of which there must be regular meetings between heads of state and governments, foreign and defense ministers, and chiefs of general staffs, periodic meetings between states' permanent representatives, and the creation of a CSCE Secretariat. It is particularly important that a center be set up to prevent and settle conflicts. H.-D. Genscher emphasized that the FRG and the USSR broadly coincide in their viewpoints on all these questions.

Stability and security, the minister went on to point out, cannot now be viewed from the military viewpoint alone. One cannot speak of European security without considering the security of the world around. Commonality of political, military, economic, ecological, and cultural relations—those will be the characteristic features of the new European stability. That is why a "Europe as a single political, economic, and legal expanse, as a single security expanse must be created" on the basis of the Helsinki Final Act. The demilitarization of East-West relations and the end to mutual hostility in these relations are important in the interests of mutual security. The Europe of the future must be based on cooperative structures in all spheres, including the security sphere.

Nonnuclear disarmament is the key question in the European organization, H.-D. Genscher went on to indicate. It must not only be a question of cuts in the numerical strength of the two great powers' Armed Forces. Other states must also be included in this process. This also applies to Germany's Armed Forces. Thus the Soviet Union's legitimate security interests will also be taken into consideration.

The minister believes that German unification will be an important stabilizing factor. It is becoming clear even now that this process is not only not impeding but also is constructively helping to build the new Europe and speeding up this process, he said. "We Germans want the Soviet Union to be able to see that it stands to gain from German unification." In the military context, Genscher indicated, a united Germany will make a substantial contribution to European stability. Hence our confirmation of our refusal to produce and own mass-destruction weapons and use force, the confirmation of our loyalty to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, our recognition in international law of the existing Polish border, and our renunciation of any territorial claims whatsoever on European states.

Realizing the importance of overcoming economic and social tension between various countries, the Federal Republic is ready for broad economic and financial cooperation with European states, H.-D. Genscher stressed in conclusion.

Ligachev, Swedish Envoy Discuss Market Economy

LD0406123490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1102 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, 4 Jun (TASS)—Yegor Ligachev, Politburo member and CPSU Central Committee secretary, today received Orjan Berner, Swedish ambassador to the USSR, at his [as received] request.

During the conversation, issues connected with the progress of perestroyka in the USSR and preparations for the CPSU for the 28th congress were touched upon. It was noted that great interest is being shown in the varied experience of other states, including Sweden, in connection with the forthcoming transfer of the Soviet Union to principles of a planned market economy.

Ligachev Leaves for Visit to Stockholm 5 Jun

LD0506131790 Moscow TASS in English 1244 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 5 TASS—Yegor Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, left Moscow for Stockholm today.

He will familiarise himself with Sweden's agro-industrial complex, cooperative movement, farms, and social policy in the agrarian sphere.

Agricultural Cooperation Discussed

LD0906014190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0940 GMT 8 Jun 90

[TASS correspondent Dmitriy Gorokhov reports]

[Excerpts] Stockholm, 8 Jun (TASS)—The success of Soviet perestroyka will have significance for all world politics. It will be to the benefit of people in the Soviet Union, and also of its neighbors. The conversation between Ye.K Ligachev, member of the Politburo and

CPSU Central Committee secretary, with Prime Minister Ingvar Carlsson, chairman of the Social Democratic Labor Party of Sweden began with this statement.

The head of the Swedish government highly evaluated the results of the Soviet-American summit, the prospects which it is opening up for international cooperation. The decisions taken at these talks signify the ending of the "Cold War" period and the switching of international relations over to a phase of constructive development.

Speaking of today's Soviet-Swedish links, I. Carlsson called them more large-scale than ever before. The expanding cooperation between the two countries is acquiring new forms. The exchange of experience in the social-economic sphere is giving the sides new ideas and knowledge.

Ye.K. Ligachev noted that people in the USSR are interested in Sweden's social practice, which has achieved great success both in economic development and in providing for the population's social protection. We by no means intend to copy foreign experience, but we do intend to study it very carefully and are ready to use what is possible.

A number of practical issues relating to bilateral cooperation, including in the agroindustrial sphere, were discussed during the conversation, in which D.A. Vasilyev, the USSR's charge d'affaires in Sweden, took part.

Practice with leaseholding and in the broad sense the whole complex of production, economic, and social issues in the present day food industry were the focus for Ye.K. Ligachev's meetings with representatives of Sweden's agrarian sector. His acquaintanceship with its structure began with visiting peasant holdings. [passage omitted]

An exchange of opinions on the main components of food policies also took place at a meeting with the editors of Swedish newspapers and television.

Speaking at it Ye.K. Ligachev said: Now, while we are restructuring both our industry and agriculture, we are conducting a search for methods and tools which we may use in socialist renewal. The conversion of defense production which is taking place in our country is called upon to play an important role in the resolution of the problems which have accumulated: the switching of the potential of military industry over to peaceful aims and its use for increasing the well-being of the people.

Our countries could cooperate effectively here. The forms of such cooperation can be seen, in particular, in the setting up of the joint manufacture of equipment for the processing of agricultural raw materials. Swedish firms will find worthy partners in us. The Soviet defense enterprises which are going over to civilian production have vast scientific and technological resources, highly qualified workers and specialists and the best equipment and materials. And the demand for equipment for the food industry and for agricultural machinery in the country, is great. After all, the level of power mechanization which Soviet agriculture has at its disposal, was present in Sweden in the 1950s. And we intend to decisively correct this.

We are also prepared to study more widely experience in the management of peasant holdings. This matter needs to be dealt with in a practical fashion. I think that the visit by our specialists to Sweden, as well as other exchanges, will help in this. We plan to use in our agriculture all forms, including leasing and cooperatives, to radically increase the level of social facilities in rural areas and to develop the processing branches of industry. For this reason the field for cooperation is of the widest.

Cooperative Movement Studied

LD0906152490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 8 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Presenter] Yegor Kuzmich Ligachev is on a visit in Sweden. Our correspondent Eduard Sorokin has recorded an interview with him. [video shows Sorokin interviewing Ligachev in rural surroundings]

[Begin recording] [Sorokin] Yegor Kuzmich, as everyone knows, various models of economic development exist: American, Japanese, West German, and Scandinavian. However, despite all the differences separating them there is something that unites them all—the capitalist market economy. Nevertheless, the USSR has recently paid intent attention to the Scandinavian and above all to the Swedish model.

[Ligachev] We are here with a group of delegates in order to make a thorough study of the following problems: First, the cooperative movement; second, questions concerning social policy, social security, state regulated prices, and also unemployment prevention measures. And I can say that we were not wrong [to come here]. Indeed, there is something here that we should consider. Of course, I absolutely agree with you that this is a completely different type of economy here which is based on private ownership of the means of production. As everyone knows, Sweden is developing within the framework of the capitalist economy and of the Western democracy. But nevertheless, although we should not emulate them, a study of their approaches and the methodology of their business would be very useful to us.

What is specifically involved here? First, the development of the cooperative movement. We feel that perhaps there is not a single Swede who would not be a cooperative member.

[Sorokin] And two million out of eight and a half million are cooperative members.

[Ligachev, chuckles] Yes, yes. That is in specific terms. But talking in terms of the entire cooperative movment they say that practically every single Swede is a cooperative member. At the same time, the cooperatives

involved are considerable in their scope and in their nature. We have encountered production, agricultural, housing, supply, consumer and credit cooperatives—in a word, I would say, cooperatives encompass the whole of production and the consumer sphere. In fact, we feel that the population of Sweden need cooperatives and they also represent a means of protection from the competition of private capital. What is more, cooperatives represent an organized force defending its interests before the state.

In the process of the perestroyka of our society, we allocate a large place to coproduction.

The second thing we find very attractive are questions concerning the state regulation of prices, especially the purchase prices on agricultural produce. That is especially important now that we are changing over to a regulated market economy. I can say that we have studied the system quite thoroughly and I feel that a whole range of approaches, methods, and ways can suit us quite well. Now that we are heading toward a socialist market—well, of course, our market is based on public ownership of the means of production—it is extremely important to prevent unemployment. For example, I said and I say it again, I do not accept the market economy if it is accompanied by mass unemployment. For no greater sorrow or calamity can befall a person than if he is deprived of the possibility to take part in social production. These are the points that we have found thoroughly attractive, and I think that we will be able to use them in our work. [end recording]

Summit, Market Economy Reviewed

PM0906183590 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 10 Jun 90 p 3

[TASS correspondent Dmitriy Gorokhov dispatch under "World Today" rubric: "Developing New Forms of Cooperation"]

[Text] Stockholm, 9 Jun—The Swedish people want good, open relations with the Soviet Union. Thage Peterson, chairman of the Swedish Riksdag (parliament), said this during a meeting with USSR People's Deputy Ye.K. Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

In the course of their conversation they had a committed exchange of opinions on the democratization of the political system of Soviet society. T. Peterson stressed that people in Sweden are following these reforms with great sympathy and wish perestroyka success. People here also welcome the new thinking in Soviet foreign policy and the course of asserting the principle of universal security in world affairs.

USSR People's Deputy O.S. Shenin, and D.A. Vasilyev, USSR charge d'affaires ad interim in Sweden, took part in the conversation.

A news conference was held at the Soviet Embassy for Swedish and foreign correspondents accredited in Stockholm. A number of questions raised by journalists concerned the prospects for international cooperation. Answering them, the CPSU Central Committee secretary said: M.S. Gorbachev's Washington meeting with the U.S. President is a very important step in the development of peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems. The improvement in the international situation is enabling us to increasingly switch the potential of our defense industry to the production of civilian output. I must be blunt and say that we associate both success in resolving the problems facing our economy and the possibility of advancing perestroyka more rapidly and substantially raising the people's standard of living with the acceleration of this process. I am also convinced that our business ties with the outside world will also expand considerably as a result.

This day in the full working program of Ligachev's stay in Stockholm was substantially devoted to familiarizing him with how the country resolves problems of employment and the fight against unemployment. The discussion touched on a broad range of practical issues—it began at the labor market administration and ended at at an employment agency.

The Swedish authorities are regulating market mechanisms in particular via the use of broad measures in the employment sphere. This line is being pursued far more vigorously here than in other Western countries. The overwhelming majority of appropriations—three-fourths—are used not to pay unemployment benefits but to prevent unemployment. This has yielded results: The unemployed in Sweden total 1.4 percent of the able-bodied population as opposed to nine percent on average throughout West Europe.

V.I. Chernoivanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers State Commission on Food and Purchases, inquired how the programs for improving workers' skills are financed. His Swedish interlocutors said that these programs are subsidized by the state to a considerable extent. At the same time trade unions and industrialists have concluded special agreements giving employees the right to be trained in the new production operations entailed by the introduction of progressive technology. This training is carried out at the enterprise's expense, without loss of terms of employment or wages.

The CPSU Central Committee secretary visited the royal library in Stockholm, in whose reading room V.I. Lenin studied. During a conversation with the library management he expressed gratitude for the respect shown to the memory of the founder of the Soviet state.

A meeting took place with Rolf Hagel, chairman of the Communist Workers' Party. The participants in the conversation exchanged information on the two parties' activities. Hagel wished the Soviet Communists'

upcoming forum success. The attention of all the world's progressive forces is attracted to this event.

On the same day the CPSU Central Committee secretary met the collective of workers at Soviet establishments in Sweden. He spoke about the progress of preparations for the 28th CPSU Congress.

Before returning home, at the TASS correspondent's request, Ye.K. Ligachev shared his impressions of his trip to Sweden. He said: This has been an interesting, useful trip. First, we sensed once again the tremendous interest there is everywhere in our affairs, in how perestroyka is going. That is the impression we received from our conversations with Prime Minister Ingvar Carlsson, other statesmen and politicians, and from our meetings with representatives of business circles and farmers.

Right now we particularly need to gain a better idea of other countries' experience, including Sweden's. Cooperatives—production, housing, supply, and credit—have been developed extensively here. They are a powerful force in the economy, developing with state support, including legislative backing. We agreed with the leadership of the Swedish Cooperative Union on very close cooperation. It may be of help to study Swedish experience in managing the cooperative sector and send our specialists here on assignment.

Our acquaintance with the Swedish agro-industrial complex was also useful. Although family farms are the most widespread here, the cooperative system also enables them to operate effectively. It takes care to ensure that everything cultivated by the peasant is delivered to the consumer intact. And there is more. We calculated that the Swedish peasant has four times more technical equipment at his disposal than our peasant does. That is one of the reasons for our agriculture's laggardness.

The countryside in Sweden is served by a powerful processing industry, while in our country it is weak. We have handled this matter badly—and indeed, to be honest, there have been no opportunities. The more resolutely we set all this to rights the more preconditions there will be for the swifter elimination of the food problem. During my meetings with Swedish business circles—and they have been our economic partners for a long time—it was proposed that joint enterprises producing food industry equipment and agricultural machinery be actively set up. Some Swedish concerns have already begun cooperating in this way.

In switching to market relations in the economy we have no intention of foregoing social protection for people, we want to preserve employment, the CPSU Central Committee secretary stressed. Our Swedish interlocutors said that the exchange of experience being organized between our countries will broaden our knowledge and conceptions of one another and help us to cooperate more effectively. We are in favor of precisely this approach.

Ye.K. Ligachev left Stockholm for Moscow today.

More on British Prime Minister's Visit

Thatcher on European Cooperation

LD1106220790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1947 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Interview with British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher by Yuriy Rostov on 10 June; place not given—recorded; Thatcher speaks in English with Russian translation superimposed]

[Rostov] In a few hours, British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher will leave our country. The visit has been busy. She has been in Moscow, Kiev, and has just returned from Armenia. Has your visit been successful?

[Thatcher] Yes, I regard it as successful and useful. I met many interesting people and went to republics which I have not previously visited, and I have learned many new things. The visit began with highly substantive talks with President Gorbachev and Ryzhkov. Then we visited Kiev. I have never previously been to the Ukraine. In Kiev, as you know, several British exhibitions are being held. They demonstrate British daily life, the British way of life and the ways in which we can help you in organizing such industries, such as, the production of foodstuffs. We are good specialists in this field. We had many interesting meetings in Kiev. We even went to the opera there.

Today, an event took place which was very emotional for me. Great Britain gave a new school to the children of Leninakan. We all remember the terrible pictures of the aftermath of the earthquake in Armenia. The British wanted to give them something that would speak of our belief in the future of the Armenian people. The new school will open on 1 September. It is a good school. It cannot be destroyed by another underground shock. We build the new building to be very stable. I recall how warmly and sincerely we were welcomed by the inhabitants of Armenia. So for me, it was a successful, pleasant, and very emotional visit.

[Rostov] Can one expect progress in economic cooperation between our countries?

[Thatcher] Yes, I am sure of that. There are many areas in which we can give each other a great deal. At the moment, you in the Soviet Union are carrying out transformations of enormous importance. It is not surprising that in the process of these complex changes there is a little uncertainty and disappointment. After all, you are moving toward an economic system which really works. You can see how it functions in Western Europe and the United States, where a very high standard of living has been achieved. In order for the economy to be effective, responsibility and initiative must be passed to those who currently manage factories and to those who open their own businesses. The essence of this greater economic freedom is that you gain the opportunity for prosperity. But this opportunity is fulfilled only if you really work well and work efficiently.

There are fields in which the British are particularly good specialists. These are agricultural production and medical equipment. We have great experience in the production of foodstuffs, and we believe that we can help you. As we have been told, many types of agricultural produce cultivated in your country are of excellent quality, of excellent quality while they are in the fields. However, produce is poorly stored and it simply never makes it to the market. Approximately 30-40 percent of it is lost. We believe that we could set up a number of joint ventures to show you how foodstuff production can be increased immediately. Simply, if you treat it carefully, your standard of living will significantly increase. This will happen merely because foodstuffs here will stop spoiling, rotting, and being idly wasted.

Recently I visited 10 Soviet children who suffered during the awful explosion on the gas pipeline to my 10 Downing Street residence. A passenger train was passing near the gas pipeline and the children were severely burned. They and their doctors came to some of our hospitals. Of course, we paid much attention to them. At present the children feel much better than before. Today, you and we are creating ties of friendship and are developing contacts between people. We are working together. These are, indeed, new processes in the international arena. They bear hope for all of us.

[Rostov] Great Britain and the Soviet Union are European countries. Very many people are currently discussing what is happening in Europe, how to make this region more stable, and by what road to proceed to stability.

[Thatcher] I think that we shall see more intensive cooperation in Europe, and based on broader ties. We, for example, would not like the Economic Community of 12 countries that has been created in Western Europe to be seen as a kind of closed club. The Community was never even conceived as such an entity. We understand very well that such cities as Warsaw, Prague, Budapest, and Moscow are European capitals. The main thing in the EEC is, of course, economic cooperation. We conclude trade agreements with other countries as a Community as a whole. But the EEC's policy is much broader than this. One of the things on which there is consensus among us, among all of the members of the EEC, is that we must pursue our political talks with the participation of all 35 countries which signed the agreement in Helsinki, the participants in the Helsinki process, the United States, Canada, the European Community, Eastern Europe, and the Soviet Union. We want to create a single community throughout the immense European continent. This is primarily a community of people who believe in democracy. A most important integral part of our concept of democracy is the need to devolve the right to make decisions from above to below; I mean devolving this right to the people. Such an entirely natural process is now under way in your country, and it is understandable that your republics aspire to make more decisions independently.

[Rostov] This is not a simple process.

[Thatcher] No, no, this cannot be an easy process, but I would like to say again, with all due respect to your country: There are in the world many federal structures. There is such a structure in the United States, for example. This is a federation where a very great deal of power belongs to the component individual state formations. Just as in the United States, the Canadian structure is the same, and in the United Mexican States. There are different states, they operate in different ways. And you will, of course, have to study the experience of other countries. In many federative states a substantial proportion of power and responsibility does not lie at the center. At the center, in the capital, is the government, which only does what no one else will be able to do. I hope that you will discover that the more we meet with one another, the more you travel, the clearer it becomes how reforms should actually be implemented in practice. It seems to me that you are now taking an immense step in the transition from conversations about principles, philosophy, and ideas, to embodying all these ideas in a practical reality. You have no need to make the same mistakes which we made in the past; you can study our mistakes, and take from us what we have that is good. We wish you success. We are very glad that our contacts are broadening. The results of the reforms in the Soviet Union will be very considerable, not only for the peoples of the Soviet Union. Soviet people will gain dignity and a higher standard of living. The results can be very considerable for the whole world. Our century has been troubled, often tragic. We have been through two world wars. The past years have been difficult for the Soviet Union. In the remaining decade we must do a very great deal of good so as to bring into the next century peace, a secure peace, so as to give our children a much better future. I hope very much that this is how it will be.

Concludes Visit 10 Jun

LD1006163590 Moscow TASS in English 1618 GMT 10 Jun 90

[Text] Kiev June 10 TASS—British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher left Kiev for Britain today. She had been in the Soviet Union on a working visit at the invitation of the Soviet leadership.

Supreme Soviet Session

Supreme Soviet Deputies Interviewed on Work

LD1106225490

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2150 GMT on 11 June, immediately following the report on the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies, broadcasts an edited report on the work of Supreme Soviet committees and commissions. A correspondent introduces the program, saying that the committees mainly discussed aspects of the government's economic reform program. Deputies are shown discussing details of the program's effects in the committee on economic reform and the ecology committee.

At 2158 GMT the correspondent interviews Deputy Komarov of the ecology committee. He says the committee is not in total support of the proposed reforms, and questions some of them.

At 2205 GMT the correspondent interviews Deputy Tetenov, chairman of the commission for transport, and Deputy Voskoboynikov, deputy chairman, on the transition to the market, who says that the transition should be made as soon as possible and that price rises are inevitable. The latter says that the price rises will be unpopular, but the supreme soviet must take responsibility for the decision.

At 2210 GMT the correspondent interviews Deputy Tabeyev from the committee for international affairs, who speaks of the need for the ussr to expand its parliamentary ties with other countries. Admiral A.I. Sorokin speaks of the transformation of the Warsaw Pact in light of the recent consultative conference. He says that the committee discussed in detail the question of compensation for property left behind by Soviet troops, and of the need for agreement on caring for the graves of Soviet troops on Warsaw Pact territory.

At 2214 GMT the correspondent interviews Deputy Kim from the committee on children's affairs who speaks of the measures required to improve the lot of children in the USSR.

At 2217 GMT the correspondent interviews Deputy Shetko, chairman of the committee for veterans and invalids affairs on the medical care available for war veterans. He says that information given was that which had been secret up until recently. He says that the figures given by the Ministry of Health do not correspond to reality, and there is a need for research into casualty figures. A coordinating center is needed, he says. Deputy Belenkov, deputy chairman of the committee for public health care, says that many of the men who served in Afghanistan are in need of psychological help and that the Soviet medical service is inadequate to their needs. He says that health passports are required for these men. International aid and international analysis is also required.

At 2225 GMT the correspondent reports on a press conference by deputies who had visited the Semipalatinsk test range, and notes their findings. A member of the deputy commission read documents on the living conditions of those near the test range. Another deputy said that there have been two periods in the life of the test range; in the first there was secrecy and lack of care; in the second, there were radiation leaks due to earthquakes. A female deputy says after visiting Semipalatinsk she saw that things were no worse than in industrial areas of the USSR. She calls for a committee of experts to be set up to discuss the issue arising from Semipalatinsk.

At 2231 GMT the report on the work of the committees and commissions ends.

Supreme Soviet Commissions, Committees Meet

LD1106203490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] Committees and commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet and its chambers were working today. It is already quite some time since they last met, and many questions have accumulated. Perhaps the most important ones are the preparations for tomorrow's decision on the government's report "On the Concept of the Transition Toward a Controlled Market Economy and the Country's Economic Situation."

A group of scientists spoke on the possible consequences of a decision of this kind and of various of its variants. Discussion of the draft law on tax to be levied from enterprises also continued. The draft law on protecting the rights of consumers, earlier known as the draft law on the quality of output, was debated by the Commission for Development of Industry, Energy Machinery and Technology.

The committees in charge of protecting people's health and of the affairs of soldiers-internationalists jointly debated the question of medical and social help for the soldiers-internationalists. There are many problems because until the beginning of this year they received such help in military medical establishments. Many details were kept secret. A considerable proportion of all those who had taken part in combat operations required various kinds of help. It has been recognized as expedient to set up a special body attached to the USSR Council of Ministers.

Gorbachev To Address Supreme Soviet 12 Jun

LD1106150290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1430 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] Today our country's Supreme Soviet deputies have been working in committees and commissions.

Tomorrow, at 1000 Moscow time the third session of the USSR Supreme Soviet will begin with a joint session of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities. The deputies will hear a statement [soobshcheniye] by

the country's president, Gorbachev, on the results of his meetings with the U.S. President and on the results of the Warsaw Pact member states Political Consultative Committee sitting.

Political & Social

Russian Parliament Declares Republic Sovereign

AU1206104690 Paris AFP in English 1045 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, June 12 (AFP)—The Russian parliament overwhelmingly declared the republic as a sovereign state on Tuesday, an AFP correspondent reported.

The declaration was adopted by 907 votes to 13 against and nine abstentions.

Russia is the biggest of the Soviet Union's 15 republics.

Deputies stood and applauded after the vote and the parliament's president, Boris Yeltsin, congratulated them on their decision.

In its declaration, the Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation said it would establish a democratic state in a revamped Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

No Balts, Other Nationalities at Peasant Congress

LD1106224190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2057 GMT 11 Jun 90

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] In Moscow, the inaugural congress of the USSR Peasant Union started its work. Among the delegates there are no representatives of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Moldavia, or Georgia. [video shows congress with Gorbachev and Ryzhkov in attendance]

Gorbachev, Ryzhkov Address CPSU Conference

LD1106171790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1649 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, 11 June (TASS)—In the CPSU Central Committee today, there was a conference of the first secretaries of the central committees of the communist parties of the union republics, kray party committees, and oblast party committees of the CPSU. It was opened by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. Nikolay Ryzhkov, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, delivered a report "on some questions connected with the transition to the regulated market economy."

The course of the preparation for the 28th congress of the CPSU and of the Russian party conference was examined. Vadim Medvedev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, delivered a report on this question.

Mikhail Gorbachev delivered a speech at the conference.

Congress Preparatory Group Discusses Program

8 Jun Meeting Viewed

PM1006165390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Jun 90 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Preparation of Program Document Under Way"]

[Text] The CPSU program document which will be submitted to the 28th CPSU Congress for consideration should absorb the collective reason of the people and serve as a reliable basis for the consolidation of Soviet society. This was discussed at the 8 June second sitting in Moscow of the working group of the CPSU Central Committee commission to prepare for the CPSU forum.

The sitting was chaired by V.A. Medvedev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. He pointed out that a considerable amount of work has been covered since the first sitting. A substantially renewed text of the program document has been prepared which incorporates many comments and proposals contained in letters and appeals from communists, press articles, and alternative platforms.

Singling out the new elements in the structure and content of the refashioned document, the CPSU Central Committee secretary proposed focusing on the main problems which have to be considered at the final stages of the document's preparation. In particular, attention was drawn to the need for the text under preparation to provide a comprehensive and in-depth analysis of and reflect questions relating to the role and place of the party in perestroyka, its social base, CPSU policy in the sphere of economic reform, and the nature of, reasons for, and means of escaping from the crisis in which our society has found itself—questions that were raised with particular vehemence during the precongress debate.

These questions were the center of a lively discussion, in which the following took part: V.K. Molochko, head of the Chernigov Pedagogical Institute Political History and Socialist Theory Department; A.Ye. Fedotov, deputy chief of the science and engineering center at Moscow's Vladimir Ilich Electromechanical Plant; Yu.A. Prokofyev, first secretary of Moscow CPSU Gorkom [City Party Committee]; A.S. Isayev, chief of the USSR Ministry of the Aviation Industry's Economics, Planning, and Management Research Institute; S.I. Goryushkin, party committee secretary at Moscow's Mikoyan Plant; V.V. Chikin, party committee secretary at the Minsk Clock and Watch Plant; V.V. Kukharchuk, deputy director of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences All-Union Cardiological Scientific Center; P.G. Bunich, prorector at the USSR Council of Ministers Academy of the National Economy; V.V. Keshelava, editor of ZARYA VOSTOKA; V.D. Popov, chief editor of the journal DIALOG; S.N. Lavrentyev, party committee secretary at the Bashkir State University; L.N.

Zaykov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; V.N. Senkov, first secretary of Leninskiy CPSU Raykom [Rayon Party Committee], Moscow; V.S. Stepin, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Philosophy Institute; Yu.M. Zabrodin, prorector of the V.I. Lenin Moscow State Pedagogical Institute and president of the USSR Society of Psychologists; and A.S. Kapto, head of the CPSU Central Committee Ideological Department.

Most of the speakers are delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress who have just undergone the trauma of the election campaign. They it were who set the tone of the debate. It was emphasized that it is particularly important to proceed from real life problems and correlate the document being prepared with the objective situation (crisis in society, increased social tension, emergence of various platforms within the party, and so on). It was also said that there is still a great deal of vagueness when it comes to determining the party's top-priority aims and with regard to the contemporary understanding of socialism and the communist perspective. Speakers expressed a desire for more throughgoing analysis of the mistakes made during the perestroyka period. There were warnings against oversimplifying the situation—revealing instead the objective laws behind the processes of society's development. It was stressed that you cannot win over and inspire the people through self-flagellation.

There was a keen discussion of the nature of the party today and what it should be like. The speakers described the section devoted to the radical reform of the party as insufficiently clear. The question of the CPSU's social base needs clarification.

Economic questions, above all the attitude toward a market economy and to the whole range of problems linked with the multiplicity of forms of ownership, generated a lively debate.

Many speakers criticized the draft program document for persisting in skirting issues [vse yeshche sokhranyayushchayasya obtekayemost] and for the vagueness of its positions, and advocated a considerable reduction in its size. By and large, however, it was noted that the renewed version of the program document represents a step forward in comparison with the previously published draft CPSU Central Committee platform for the 28th party congress.

It was deemed advisable to involve congress delegates, along with the authors of alternative platforms, extensively in further work on the document.

A detailed report from the working group sitting will be published in PRAVDA.

More on Program Meeting

PM1106152990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Jun 90 Second Edition p 3

[Unattributed "abridged transcript" of 8 June discussion at the CPSU Central Committee carried under the rubric "Discussion Pamphlet No 44": "Relying on the Party's Collective Reason. We Discuss Work on the Draft Program Document for the 28th CPSU Congress"]

[Text] As already been reported, a routine session of the Commission To Prepare the Draft CPSU Program Document for the 28th party congress was held at the CPSU Central Committee 8 June 1990 under V.A. Medvedev's chairmanship. We now present readers with an abridged transcript of this session.

V.A. Medvedev: We have entered the concluding stage of precongress work, which is currently under way in all areas. Several working groups—including our group—on the program document are operating within the framework of the commission to prepare for the 28th CPSU Congress. A large group of congress delegates is taking part in their activity.

As we agreed, the text of the draft document has been prepared for today's session in the light of the proposals and comments expressed at the previous session. Many comments and proposals from communists' letters and appeals, from the press, and from various alternative platforms have been taken into account. Today's discussion should clearly be focused on the main points, the new things proposed with regard to the structure of the document, the formulation of individual problems, and the main questions for discussion.

The discussion about the **party's name**—which, you understand, is by no means of purely terminological importance—is continuing. There have been proposals for the party to change its name to Socialist Party, Social Democratic Party, Party of Democratic Socialism, or Social Democratic Workers Party. Other names have been suggested as well. A number of comrades even view questions of changing the party's name as a condition for their continued membership of it. Clearly, this problem will be raised at the congress as well.

Indeed, the party is being renewed. We all want it to become after the congress in a definite sense a renewed party free from the burden of deformations in terms of its place in society, the content and methods of its work, and its internal party relations.

All this provides definite grounds for a possible clarification of its name. Moreover, it is now clear that the communist future is not as close as it appeared in 1919, when the party changed its name from the Social Democratic Party to the Communist Party. That was clearly a bit premature.

And yet I am convinced that the party should not bring about confrontation by changing its name. First, this is opposed by the overwhelming majority of CPSU members, who joined a Communist Party. Second, this was Lenin's name for the party and it is now a historical, political, and—if you like—moral asset for us. Finally—and this is stated in the proposed draft—we will remain a party not only of socialist choice but of a communist future.

On the structure of the submitted document. At the previous session we agreed to a three-part structure for the document, and to highlight three sections instead of the seven proposed in the published draft. I think that the document will benefit from this and become more valuable and logical.

The preamble has been radically changed. It highlights the deep-seated reasons behind the crisis experienced by the country—reasons which are not associated with the "collapse" of the socialist idea itself but with the deformed model which emerged under the specific historical conditions of the initial stage of the emergence and development of the new system, with the inability of the authoritarian-bureaucratic system to move the country into the mainstream of human civilization. The preamble provides, in my view, a fundamentally important understanding of perestroyka as a transition from state, authoritarian-bureaucratic socialism to humane, democratic socialism.

The first section has undergone major changes. Its title has been changed. It is now called "The Ideological and Theoretical Foundations of Perestroyka." Four subsections [bloki] are proposed. Here we can find what was in the published draft, including the rubrics "The Legacy Which the CPSU Is Abandoning" and "What the CPSU Is Taking Into the Future." The last subsection has been amplified with the thesis that the CPSU proceeds on the basis of a creative approach to the theory of socialism, which develops on the path of the constructive interpretation of 20th-century socialism and the experience of general world development, including the materialist dialectics of Marx, Engels, and Lenin and other achievements of human reason. The third subsection is "Communists' Social Ideal." It attempts to provide an integral description of humane democratic socialism. We should probably assess how successfully this has been done.

With regard to the **communist future.** We are against the imposition of utopian plans on society, but we see the communist future as a natural consequence of the development of world civilization and as practical progress toward a future society where the free development of each is the condition of the free development of all.

Finally, the fourth subsection provides a description of the present stage of perestroyka. It briefly discusses its achievements and covers in far more detail its shortcomings and the crisis phenomena which have encompassed all spheres of society's life. And difficulties are associated not only with our historical legacy, but also with the specific decisions and actions which took place during perestroyka.

It also tries—perhaps not wholly successfully—to define the party's social basis. It states that in conditions of growing diversity of—and sometimes even confrontation between—the interests of different social groups and the intensifying threat of pressure on the state and society from antipeople forces and shadowy economic and political structures, the CPSU sees its main task as being to become a party consolidating working people and uniting and supporting all those who through their honest labor create the people's well-being and spiritual assets and ensure their security.

The second section is entitled "Action Program." This introduces certain new theses. Including a thesis on the importance of labor as the foundation of well-being. This problem was somehow submerged in the previous draft, and therefore a desire was expressed to boost the theme of labor. We have tried to do so.

The rubric "For an Efficient Economy," which sets out the main points of the present-day program for the transition to a regulated market economy, has been reworked. In this sense many ideas in the program chime with the government's economic program. But we should not duplicate the executive's proposals. The CPSU document sets out the basic principles of the policy rather than specific practical steps, figures, or timetables. Moreover, the government program itself needs further improvement.

One of the key problems is the **question of ownership**, which is arousing sharp debate. This section should discuss, in particular, whether it is possible for state ownership to exist in joint-stock form. It is well known that many people believe that joint-stock ownership is no longer state ownership and not even public ownership. There are new points connected with the introduction of a thesis on labor private ownership, whose historical potential has not been exhausted. It is stressed that, under the democratic control of working people, this form of ownership can work to improve the people's life and benefit socialism.

We ought to think about the fact that we must not only formulate some kind of principles of socioeconomic policy, but also attempt to reveal a mechanism for their implementation taking account of the fact that, under present-day conditions, the CPSU should not and cannot issue directives to state and economic organs, but should operate via communists working in the soviets, the government, and so forth.

The most substantial changes have been made to the section "The Radical Perestroyka of the Party." And this is no accident. After all, the questions of the CPSU's future, the forms and methods of its activity, and the democratization of internal party relations have been at the center of the precongress discussion. This section takes substantial account of proposals from alternative platforms. The draft more clearly formulates the party's functions, which largely tally with their theoretical, ideological, political, and organizational interpretation in the "Democratic Platform." In my view, the draft now formulates the political function rather narrowly, essentially reducing it to election campaigning and parliamentary activity. Although it is well known that political work among the masses must be conducted daily, not only at election time.

Democratic centralism is a fundamental question. The working group proposes a formula condemning the Stalinist interpretation of the principles of democratic centralism and the view of the party as a hierarchical and rigidly centralized organization. It states that the CPSU will firmly implement democratic principles guaranteeing the power of the party masses—contested elections, glasnost, accountability, removability from office, and subordination of the minority to the majority with the minority retaining the right to defend its views. And the minority's right to defend its views and convictions must be safeguarded.

The working group proposes reaffirming the territorial-production principle of party building. But it stresses that the tasks of the political struggle and the political work under way among the population make it necessary to develop strong and active primary territorial organizations. It is proposed that CPSU members be granted the right to choose the primary organization—the production organization, the territorial organization, or both—in which they will work.

It is proposed to support the creation of a Russian Communist Party as an important factor in strengthening the sovereignty and resolving the most important problems of our union's largest republic. But, naturally, the creation of a [Russian] Communist Party should be seen in the overall context of the strengthening of the CPSU, rather than of its weakening, still less its split into ethnic detachments.

The draft contains no theses on party organs, the mass media, the budget, or the structure of top leading organs. These are questions for the CPSU Statutes. At the same time, a very important rubric has been added on the party's collaboration with other social organizations operating within the framework of the constitution, and on the development of dialogue and cooperation with movements and organizations of a socialist orientation.

An important question requiring discussion is that of the CPSU's political and moral responsibility for the situation prevailing in the country. It is clear that we have no right to sidestep this problem. The proposed draft states that the CPSU, as the ruling party for more than 70 years, does not shirk such responsibility. But we are against pinning the blame on all CPSU members. Generations of communists have selflessly and disinterestedly served the people, upheld the ideals of the revolution and socialism, and fought courageously for the motherland's freedom and independence. There have always been vibrant forces within the CPSU, and it was these which were ultimately able to advocate the perestroyka of society and the party on a genuinely socialist basis.

I want to reemphasize that this is, of course, an interim, working draft, and we will have to do our utmost to ensure that the program document encapsulates to the greatest possible extent the results of the precongress debate and communists' collective reason and serves as a basis for party consolidation.

What the Program Document Will Be Like

V.K. Molochko, faculty chief at the Chernigov Pedagogical Institute: I'd like to give the comrades who drew up the second draft Central Committee Platform for the 28th congress a pat on the back. The submitted draft is greatly different from the previous version—and for the better. Of course, there will be many comments, but nonetheless we have taken a big step forward.

A.Ye. Fedotov, deputy chief of the Vladimir Ilich Electromechanical Plant's Science and Engineering Center in Moscow: Daily conversations in shops and in the design, scientific, and engineering services show that communists and non-communists are awaiting the party documents currently under preparation with great hope and excitement. My opinion is that the prepared draft document is undoubtedly a major step forward. But our task now is to convince people that the 28th congress is the watershed where the party will become a truly leading force armed with documents with a clearly constructive thrust.

That is why I would propose formulating theses for an action program of four or five pages which would set out the party's aims in condensed form, formulate the concepts of socialism and communism, and analyze the position in the country and ways of getting out of it.

Yu.A. Prokofyev, first secretary of Moscow CPSU City Committee: At the last commission session we said that the previous draft was too loose and hard to understand. It seems to me that the document submitted today suffers from the same shortcoming. The style is not appropriate to today's dramatic state of society. We need a more laconic and dynamic document.

The fact that there are now three rather than seven sections is valid and logical. But I would propose a different form of organization. The first section should be "The Ideological and Theoretical Foundations of Perestroyka" and the second section should be "Radical Perestroyka in the Party" since the question of what the party will be like concerns both Communists and non-party people alike. And the third section should be an action program—but more laconic, specific, and tied to a definite time frame.

S.I. Goryushkin, party committee secretary at the Mikoyan Plant (Moscow): In my view this document should not be used in the current situation as an action program allowing us to consolidate communists. People are not expecting a selection of phrases and slogans, as we have heard for a long time, but entirely concrete action—and at a minimum of three levels.

The first level is ways out of the crisis: What measures are we proposing? The second level is how we propose to raise the people's living standard after getting out of the

crisis. And the third level is the principles and general political theses currently in the document.

P.G. Bunich, prorector of the USSR Council of Ministers Academy of the National Economy: The document should probably be briefer and more constructive. What are the people expecting, and what should be done to restore the party's prestige? Nobody will accept a regurgitation of former ideas. Nor will they accept new bouts of self-flagellation. This is not enough, the people are already used to self-flagellation.

It seems to me that the actual title of the document should be different. Not "Toward Democratic, Humane Socialism" but possibly "Toward a Flourishing and Free Society." When things are so bad, it might seem that you shouldn't talk about prosperity. However, we are talking not only about the current period, but about the future too. We need a new title not least because we have not understood "humane, democratic socialism." Moreover, these concepts duplicate each other.

Finally, if people can believe something, it is figures rather than words. And if there are no figures, forgive me, this is all just waffle. If there are no figures it won't be convincing at all. If there are figures there may also be some doubts, but there will at least be some idea of what we can hope to achieve. I'm not saying that there should be 20 tables as in a Gosplan [State Planning Committee] document. But there should be 10 main figures on the people's prosperity. I was recently in Greece when the election campaign was under way. It resulted in victory for a new party which had previously lacked detailed economic information at a countrywide level. Nonetheless, it went into the elections with concrete economic plans. We have an entire Gosplan and Finance Ministry—who is stopping us from presenting a concrete program?

V.D. Popov, chief editor of the magazine DIALOG: I asked myself: "Would I vote for this document at the 28th congress?" I would only vote for it to be adopted as a basis with substantial amendments. As a delegate I have met with many labor collectives and tried to project the draft onto the state of social awareness and the social tension existing in the country. If we set ourselves the goal of overcoming the crisis in the party and restoring its prestige, then, to be blunt, the document largely fails to address these tasks.

One other point. We are again facing an attempt to cover everything and provide answers to everything. To tackle everything and move everything forward. It seems to me that by so doing we may discredit the party. The draft has no dominant, strikingly pithy ideas. It has no appeals or slogans, if you like. At turning points—remember the revolution—people always followed Bolshevik communists when they spoke succinctly, even punchily.

S.N. Lavrentyev, party committee secretary at the Bashkir State University: I don't entirely agree with Comrade Popov. The "rough language of placards" will probably be insufficient to express the full complexity of the situation we are going through. We must not confuse a program document with a leaflet. Although it should undoubtedly contain snappy journalistic elements. It seems to me that it contains too many ritual statements.

L.N. Zaykov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo: I think that we have not yet found a title for the document. What is it—a platform, an action program, or a draft CPSU Program? If we're talking about the CPSU Program, the new version of which was adopted at the 27th congress, it does not accord with the ideas of perestroyka today.

It states that the party is failing to set the task of elaborating a large-scale program for the congress. Why are we talking on the party's behalf? The party has indeed set itself this task. That is why comrades today are saying: Give us figures, give us specific action.

As to the size of the document, it should be cut by at least one-third. And the main thing is to make it easy for all communists to understand. There are many turns of phrase which most communists will not understand.

One last point. At the March Central Committee Plenum many people talked about clearly stating the positions the party continues to espouse—Marxism-Leninism and fidelity to communist ideals. We have again avoided clear-cut definitions.

V.N. Senkov, first secretary of Leninskiy party raykom [rayon committee] (Moscow): The program should be theoretically and scientifically substantiated. But this is precisely what it lacks. We have attempted to boil down all the main questions and problems concerning society and communists into a document and present it as an action program for the party. And this, in my view, explains all these bland formulas, vague promises, and everything that arouses arguments.

Yu.M. Zabrodin, prorector of the V.I. Lenin Moscow State Pedagogical Institute and president of the USSR Psychologists' Society: We fail to take account in the document of the reaction of those people who will read it. Nor do we take account of the reaction of communist delegates, rank-and-file communists, and—above all—the potential voters who will be supporting the party in its struggle for power under a multiparty system. We are still in thrall to our former theoretical constructs. In certain cases we identify society with the state, the party with the party apparatus, and theory with policy. We must show people how our state will appear as a result of the transformations and what conditions people will be living under.

A.S. Kapto, chief of the CPSU Central Committee Ideological Department: I support the opinion that in terms of its form and content the document requires major additional work, and in a number of cases needs to be reworked, including [with regard to] specific formulas, the language, and so forth. The vagueness and lack of clarity in the basic concepts is a key problem. I'm

thinking of the concepts of socialism, communism, communist ideals, the party itself, the market economy, and so forth.

I'm not scared that some readers will not share our position. It is better that they do not share it, provided it is clear. And there is another matter which concerns me. A kind of contradiction has now emerged between the ideas we have worked out at the current stage and the opinion of the entire population and communists formulated on the basis of the published draft Central Committee platform.

We now have a new package of ideas, formulas, and approaches, but the party is continuing to work along old lines. This is a very serious phenomenon. I needed only to recall at the Crimean Oblast party conference that the commission is now at work and the draft platform will undergo major reworking, for a written question to be asked: So why are you making us discuss things now if you've got some new ideas? I want to make a specific proposal. We need to urgently determine how to ensure that public opinion is amended before the congress in the spirit of the new ideas and to work out a document so we can publish it, as an interim document, some time on the eve of the All-Russian Conference.

On the Crisis in the Party and Society

Yu.A. Prokofyev: The analysis of the current period and the reasons behind the crisis in the country seem inadequate and too bland. I met yesterday with worker delegates to the 28th city conference and the 28th party congress. And it must be said that they make a sharper assessment of the situation in which the country currently finds itself. It seems unconvincing to me to highlight creative principles in the current crisis. By so doing it is as if we are trying to reaffirm that crisis is an inevitable part of development. But was the crisis in which we find ourselves inevitable, or is it a result of errors in the implementation of the perestroyka policy?

V.V. Chikin, secretary of the Minsk Clock and Watch Plant party committee: I too believe that a more serious effort should be made to identify the causes of the crisis that has affected the party and society—both objective and subjective. This must be done if only to make people realize that in the future the party will not make the mistakes it has made in the past 70 years.

The analysis of the causes of the crisis can be taken from the "Democratic Platform," in which they are set out in a pretty honest and concise form, or from our Belorussian "Manifesto of a Communist Party Undergoing Renewal."

S.N. Lavrentyev: I agree that it is necessary to provide a more trenchant and frank description of the crisis. There is some justification in what the document says about the crisis not being indicative of the failure of the actual idea of socialism. But if one remembers Lenin's theory and work "On Our Revolution," the causes of the future crisis are defined there, in principle. The chief one is the fact that the country was petty bourgeois. Petty bourgeois consciousness leads to elementary leveling. The fact that we had totalitarianism and leveling socialism in many respects harks back to this description. The failure to solve the tasks of the cultural revolution, which was seen in terms of leading the masses to an appreciation of the ideas of socialism, was also at the root of the crisis. We have not solved this task either.

V.S. Stepin, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Philosophy: We are supposed to talk clearly about the mistakes of perestroyka. But the question is: Do we know what the mistakes are?

For the economy to be able to function, it needs an infrastructure. Here this infrastructure was tied to party leadership of the economy and became enmeshed with it. Material and labor resources and finance—all this was allocated as a result of major party decisions and then the decisions were implemented by means of a hierarchical system. In our sectoral economic organization system the party was the sole organization providing integration at rayon, oblast, and republic level, because the Council of Ministers was unable to do so. When we dismantled this and got rid of economic regulation, the links were broken, but we did not create any others. This idea is present in the document, expressed in a general way: We have destroyed the old structures, but we have not created new ones. So it is not all that simple, I believe, so far as the mistakes of perestroyka are concerned. It would be unrealistic to expect our party leadership to have foreseen everything when it embarked on perestroyka. It is easy to look back and say why something failed. Major historic changes will always produce the unexpected.

The Ideological Foundations of Party Policy

A.S. Isayev, chief of the USSR Ministry of the Aviation Industry Scientific Research Institute of Economics, Planning, and Management: We appear to be using terms which we have become accustomed to, which exist in the form of stereotypes. We have not defined what we mean by socialism, what we mean by communism, but we are arguing about what kind of party we should have: socialist or communist. Unless we explain now what they mean, the people will not follow us and the party will lose its influence once and for all.

Remember Marx. He defined communism as an era, as a process during which private ownership is destroyed. But we are going in the opposite direction at the moment; it is reemerging. We have nothing but contradictions on this question.

V.V. Chikin: Under the rubric "The Legacy Which the CPSU Is Abandoning" the authors resolutely and solemnly reject in the name of all communists things that the bulk of party members are innocent of. They renounce, for instance, "neglect of general human values." I, for one, have never neglected them. I have kept the commandments: Thou shalt not kill, thou shalt not steal. They renounce "the view of the world as an

arena of confrontation." The workers of the Minsk clock and watch plant have never viewed the world as an arena of confrontation.

It is a good thing that the document has attempted to reveal what humane, democratic socialism is. But I think this point still needs to be worked on. It is necessary to reflect more clearly how socialism relates to questions of ownership, particularly private ownership.

V.D. Popov: I would also like to talk about the ideological and theoretical foundations of perestroyka. I am sorry to be so blunt, but there are no foundations. It has been said here, for example, that the party is setting out the basic principles and guidelines of perestroyka. What was it that it set out before? We are saying this five years on! It is said that in its philosophical principles the CPSU adopts a creative approach to the theory of socialism. This thesis also needs to be explained. The attitude toward Marxism and toward Leninism should also be clearly expressed. I have discovered a paradoxical thing. Whenever I address labor collectives and say that from Marxism you need to take the methodology, treat it dialectically, and also rely on native, Russian thought, I often hear: Excuse me, if you are against Marxism, we are not with you. It seems to me that it is necessary to take everything of value that the theory of social democracy has to offer, in particular socialist values.

V.S. Stepin: It is right to want a clear-cut definition of what socialism is and what communism is. But I must say that the level of current theoretical thought and of current theoretical studies is such that as soon as we start to provide clear-cut, rigorous definitions of these concepts we are immediately faced with a mass of conflicting opinions and we are never going to reach agreement here.

I believe we could say that we are at least renouncing the concept of building socialism in a single country, which was put forward without sufficient theoretical analysis. It led only to utopian programs and undue stress for the country. I would point out that Marx saw communism as the process of development of the whole of world civilization.

Practical Action Program

Yu.A. Prokofyev: We are preparing a concrete action plan, not a party program. That being the case, it should be geared to a definite time frame, say three to five years. And if a specific time frame is defined, there will have to be priorities, a mechanism, and stages for the implementation of these actions. It seems to me that from this viewpoint the economic section of the document needs to be more detailed.

A.S. Isayev: Yes, I see the economic section as the most significant. If we do not get the economy straightened out we will not get anything else straightened out. Many things require clarification. We want to switch to a so-called regulated market, but the conditions for the switch are not fully or precisely formulated. The market will not appear to order, but only when owners appear. As long as the state monopoly on ownership of the means of production exists, there will be no market, no matter how much we proclaim its existence.

V.V. Chikin: I would like to object to Comrade Isayev. He insists that the presence of owners is a condition of the appearance of the market. Nothing of the sort. The presence of the autonomous, independent commodity producer, acting alternately as vendor and purchaser, is the condition of the market's appearance. If the state entitles its enterprises to be autonomous commodity producers and stops interfering in their activities, the conditions will arise for the appearance of the market.

P.G. Bunich: The document should signify that we will now be making progress on all fronts. Particularly the economic. But here we are still at the level we were at before the government declaration on the market economy. We have not come down to the level of the government declaration. The pity is that we did not rise to a higher level and provide the draft with a way out of the crisis leading to the market and prosperity. And the people do not like this either.

Yu.M. Zabrodin: The document neglects a very important question connected with the problem of forms of ownership. There is ownership by public organizations. In my view, it could be the alternative to both state and private ownership.

L.N. Zaykov: I am very worried about the social section of the action program. Haven't we promised rather too much? The impression is that the comrades have been at pains not to forget any of the problems that face us. But it is not clear where the money is going to come from and how we are going to solve them. We are criticized for this, and rightly so.

V.V. Kukharchuk, deputy director of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences All-Union Cardiological Science Center: As a representative of medical science, I would like it to be more clearly underlined that concern for the nation's health is one of the party's paramount tasks. This is reflected in the document, but the wording is somewhat traditional and vague. There must be mention of protection for mothers and children.

As for the nationalities question, in my view, the document does not contain a clear provision to the effect that nations have the right to self-determination and separation. The formula is: This is inadvisable and it is better to do it within the context of the union. But real life demonstrates that this thesis is not entirely correct. It should say: The party, reviving Leninist norms of nationalities policy, acknowledges the right of every nation to self-determination and separation, if the people so decide, for example, by means of a referendum.

V.V. Keshelava, editor of the paper ZARYA VOSTOKA (Tbilisi): I agree with Comrade Kukharchuk. No matter how hard we try, we will not get away from ethnic problems, because we live in a multinational state. So if

we want to preserve the union state, I consider it intolerable that our program documents at the 28th party congress should mention this important problem only in passing, as it were. The problem of the union of republics has to be analyzed by us and an acceptable wording has to be found.

V.A. Medvedev: But you have obviously noticed that in the proposed version the focus of attention is switched precisely to the word union. It is clear that there must be full sovereignty of the union republics and union relations between our republics.

S.I. Goryushkin: The document talks about implementing citizens' rights at least at the level of international norms. I think that we are simply bound to say what norms we intend to raise to that level first of all. There is also talk of improving the electoral system, but what is meant here? If it means changing the structure of the supreme organ of power, for example, switching from the election of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies to direct election of a two-chamber parliament, that must also be stated. Our proposed timetable for doing this is also important.

Renewal of the Party

V.V. Keshelava: We must explain what kind of party we are speaking for and reflect that in the document. It is not just a question of the name. I mean: Is it the party which held the monopoly of power and which was essentially the state party, or a party representing a certain social movement? We are refraining from regarding ourselves as the state party, which is reflected in the document. The radical reform of the CPSU which we are trying to carry out presents us with the question of creating essentially a qualitatively new party. And we must show what the substance of our radicalism is and what we are changing. It seems to me that we are changing little.

Each of us knows that the CPSU's prestige has declined. The social movements which have emerged in recent years are finding a great response among the population and the most diverse strata of society. If we want to be an effective political force, we must change our guidelines and structures. We must take into account first and foremost that we will inevitably be operating in conditions of a multiparty system. This fundamental factor must be our starting point.

We still face a very complex problem. If we want the party to consolidate our forces across the country as a whole, we must find flexible forms which make it possible not to cause a clash of interests but to bring the peoples closer together. This is the only way out of the state of crisis in which many republic party organizations have found themselves. They must be regarded as autonomous, independent national communist parties.

I am confident that if we proceed from the interests of our common movement, we will find in ourselves an understanding of the fact that Georgian Communists, just like Ukrainian and Russian communists, must try to implement the same aims and common ideals. It is on that basis that we must unite and find some form of union. If we do not change our form in good time, we will lose more than we have lost so far.

B.N. Senkov: In Section 3 a rubric entitled "Autonomy and Unity" has been singled out. But we approach autonomy timidly and write: "Primary organizations may..." If it is a question of autonomy it must be stated plainly that primary party organizations do such-and-such.

We merely declare the unity of the union republics' communist parties, but what is the basis of that unity? What is the party Central Committee's role in this? These questions must be answered.

For some reason we modestly play down the role and place of the CPSU Program that is in force today. It would probably be expedient to adopt at the congress a document assessing the existing program and stating that from that moment it ceases to operate.

V.D. Popov: About the party's name. First, I would take a historical approach here. There used to be the Russian Social Democratic Workers Party, the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks), the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks), and in the fifties the CPSU came into being. The tasks changed, and so did the strategic guidelines, the goals, and the name of the party. There is nothing dreadful in this.

Yu.M. Zabrodin: We have not mentioned a number of problems which trouble communists today, in particular, the question of party property. We must also express more clearly our attitude toward the principle of democratic centralism. It is necessary to explain what the basis of the organizational principle of party building is—the subordination of the minority to the majority or the idea of consensus. I believe that the minority is obliged to carry out adopted decisions until such time as new ones are adopted. But it must have a full right to any political, informational, propaganda, and other actions.

A.S. Isayev: It seems to me that a new concept of "statutorily defined [kompetentsionnyy] democratic centralism" should be introduced. Without discipline and subordination the party cannot exist. But the statutes must clearly define the limits of the competence whereby a superior organ can issue orders to an inferior one.

B.K. Molochko: Let us raise the following question. On what grounds and by what right does the Communist Party undertake to lead the processes of perestroyka?

S.I. Goryushkin: A situation has taken shape today in which we, having stated that we bear responsibility for everything that has happened in our country, realize that apart from the CPSU there is no other organization with such a powerful structure, means of influence, and intellectual potential in the form of its cadres. And no

one will be able to resolve the task of overcoming the crisis at less cost to society. Without us the social cost of overcoming the crisis may be simply huge. That idea, it seems to me, should also be reflected in the document.

Summarizing the ideas of the discussion, Comrade V.A. Medvedev said that today's discussion was quite meaningful.

It can be stated that the version of the document proposed by the working group meets with a generally constructive reaction and reflects the moods and opinion of the public and communists on the refining of the party's program document. That is shown, for example, by a comparison of it with the "Position of the Moscow City Party Organization."

I think that the "Position" should be used more fully. Some kind of synthesis must be found, and not only in terms of content, where there are no differences, but also in terms of form and brevity of exposition, so as to make the formulations more concise. I agree that you cannot encompass everything, you cannot aim to cover the whole range of questions or cover every square yard. You have to highlight the most important questions, the priorities, in the light primarily of social moods and the most acute problems which our society is experiencing. And perhaps actually introduce the most indicative figures where this is appropriate.

I want to return once more to the title of the document. I would not abandon the title "Toward Humane, Democratic Socialism" now. Despite the validity and, in many respects, logic of the criticism, there have not been any suggestions yet which are less susceptible to criticism. But reflection on the title should not stop.

As for the subheading "Action Program," I think that this does not fully accord with the intention or character of the document. We should seek another version, "Principles of Action," perhaps, so that the document does not claim to be a party program yet at the same time is not reduced to a mere listing of narrowly pragmatic actions.

V.V. Keshelava raised a very important question—about the kind of party whose program this is, is this the document of a "state" party, as was traditionally the case in our country throughout past decades, or of a party as a sociopolitical organization? At the moment we still have not fully moved away from the old stereotypes or the identification of a party program document with a document having a general state character. It is clear that this must now be the program of a party as a sociopolitical organization which is addressed to the people and has the aim of winning their political support. That is why I regard figures with such caution. Too many figures would reduce us to imitating past documents which issued congress directives for the five-year plan.

I would also like to talk about the interpretation of the crisis that our country is going through. It is necessary to distinguish the historical character—the crisis of the old model of socialism which occurred not one, not two, not even five years ago, from that which has emerged in the past two years and which could and should have been avoided entirely. This makes it possible to approach many things more correctly. I favor talking about the causes of the historical crisis and about those actions not appropriate to the demands of the situation which occurred in the years of perestroyka. We must talk about them frankly. But we must not lump them all together—we must understand that these are processes of a different scale and that their solution demands a specific approach.

How should work on the documents continue? By means of broader collective efforts. I would ask the participants in the conference—the members of the working group and congress delegates—to offer concrete suggestions on the text and take a direct part in the further work on the documents.

There must also be joint work involving representatives of alternative positions and platforms. Indeed, it has already begun. It is important not only to coordinate positions but, if that is impossible, to clearly define the differences of opinion and present different versions too.

After further work on the document we could raise the question of acquainting congress delegates with the draft. We shall have to meet again for that.

Two-Part 28th CPSU Congress Advocated

PM0506161790 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jun 90 p 1

[V. Dobrotin article under the rubric "Attempt at a Forecast": "Is a Split Inevitable? Reflections a Month Before the Opening of the 28th CPSU Congress"]

[Text] It is difficult to forecast the outcome of the 28th CPSU Congress a month before it has opened. Nonetheless, it is not an entirely hopeless task.

The outcome will be determined primarily by the composition of the congress. At its March plenum the party Central Committee took an important step toward democratizing elections—even though this goes against the Statutes which are currently in force—and authorized direct, equitable elections from a choice of candidates in party okrugs. However, loopholes remain. So, for instance, party conferences were able, if they so wished, to eliminate unsuitable, undesirable candidates. The CPSU Central Committee open letter can be used as a formal pretext for this. Why is it impossible to take a decisive step without stumbling? The situation at present is such that any current in the party which is not satisfied with the results of elections can declare them undemocratic and use this argument as an instrument for a parting of the ways. The credentials commission at the congress will have a hard job, in my opinion...

In my view the composition of the congress is likely to be rather motley. The future alignment of forces remains

unclear. I am almost convinced that the congress will not be conservative. A victory for the conservative wing would have disastrous consequences for the country, so let us assume that this is a stage of perestroyka which is behind us. It cannot be ruled out that the majority of the congress will be in the loyally centrist mold. The question to what extent the congress as a whole will be radical remains open...

It is as yet unclear whether the organizational and technical backup will be provided for the work of all delegates. For instance, the facilities for roll-call voting. The rate of representation at the congress and the number of its delegates have been decided in mechanical fashion, it seems. It is hardly appropriate to make the number of delegates directly dependent on the capacity of the building. The congress may choke on the multiplicity of its own opinions. In that event the congress will be assigned the role of a consultative organ, which is not an unusual role. However, the congress (or at least part of it) is not likely to agree to this.

The most constructive alternative is for a vast amount of preparatory work to be done, co-reports on all fundamental questions of the agenda to be defined, and work to be organized in sections. The congress could also be held in two stages. This would most likely be the most promising course of action to adopt. Therefore it would be most expedient to only set a tentative date for the end of the congress. The objective of the first stage could be to adopt priority resolutions, consolidate the healthy forces of the congress, discuss the draft party Platform and Statutes, and handing them down to the primary organizations. The second stage could be devoted to the adoption of these fundamental documents in their final form and the election of central organs. This idea was put forward at the Central Committee February Plenum in the speech by Yu.P. Arkhipov from "Izhorskiy Zavod."

The outcome of the congress will be largely determined by the agenda that is adopted. The congress is hardly likely to take the beaten track of a party-economic aktiv. But will it rise to the level of a genuine political forum?

The outcome of the congress will depend on the intensity of overt (ideological) and covert (political and organizational) confrontation during its proceedings. It will hardly be possible to manipulate it like the Congress of People's Deputies. The position of delegates will also be qualitatively different. There is no alternative legislative organ of power for people's deputies. In the event of disagreement with the majority, the parliamentary minority may form an opposition (at best, a constructive opposition). However, in the practice of political parties there is another choice: It is possible for the congress to open with one party and to end with two.

Is a split inevitable? The voice of all currents, platforms, and groups must be heard at the highest party forum. The main thing is to prevent inter-faction struggle from swamping a substantive section of the congress. The outcome of the congress will depend on the extent to which the delegates appreciate the political responsibility which is demanded of them. Therefore the quest for a fundamental democratic consensus must, from the very beginning, form the basis of the congress proceedings.

After all, is it not obvious that the political meaning of the 28th CPSU Congress will be distilled not in the discussion which takes place, not in the speeches of individual delegates (even highest-rank delegates), but in **the documents which it adopts.** The old technique of deliberately shifting emphasis to the debate will not work. If an attempt of this kind is made, it will be fraught with the danger of a split from the outset. All the past events (including the 21st All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League Congress) have shown that the battle of opinions reaches its apogee exactly during the summing up and the adoption of final documents. Maybe the congress will even need a conciliation commission.

Why am I so persistent in my appeals for consolidation? Why am I against a split in the party? Is it really possible to achieve a consensus between the conservatives and the radicals? Of course not. But first, neither the conservatives nor the radicals are the whole party. The basis for the consolidation could be provided precisely by a parting of ways with the conservatively orthodox section of the party.

The conservatives tormented by nostalgia for their better past have no chance in a democratic society. But unfortunately, at this precise moment a sufficiently clear-cut and integral ideological basis for unification does not exist. All the platforms submitted for partywide discussion have very grave flaws.

Essentially, we are having to make a choice when there is either no choice, or we are having to make it on the basis of the not very sensible principle of choosing "the lesser of two evils." At the moment communists are swamped with new concepts, views, and proposals. The party masses must interpret them ideologically and also absorb them purely psychologically. This needs time. The party must fundamentally define its position and the new unifying current must gather strength. It has to be borne in mind that when a rift between leftists and centrists takes place, it is frequently rightists who enter the arena, and for them the differences between the first two are just as immaterial as any polemics concerning the democratic foundations of the party. History abounds in analogues. Finally, the congress will probably bring forth the names of new political personalities, which are needed no less than conceptual ideas.

To sum up—the congress may be crowned with success. But only if, as a minimum, the following conditions are assured—a democratic composition, total openness with nothing being left unsaid, adoption of radical solutions, and a qualitative renewal of the central organs. And provided that a maelstrom of political extremes does not introduce unforeseen changes of direction.

Decree Implementing USSR Citizenship Law

WA1106192690 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 1 Jun 90 p 1

[Decree of the USSR Supreme Soviet: "On a Procedure for Implementing the USSR Law 'On USSR Citizenship'"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet decrees:

1. To implement the USSR Law "On USSR Citizenship" on 1 January 1991.

2. The USSR Law "On USSR Citizenship" is applied to legal relations arising after the implementation of the above-named Law, that is to say on 1 January 1991.

3. At the moment that the USSR Law "On USSR Citizenship" is implemented, to recognize that the following are invalid:

The 1 December 1978 USSR Law "On USSR Citizenship" (VEDOMOSTI USSR SUPREME SOVIET, 1978, No. 49, p 816);

The 1 December 1978 USSR Supreme Soviet decree "On the Implementation of the USSR Law 'On USSR Citizenship'" (VEDOMOSTI USSR SUPREME SOVIET, 1978, No. 49, p 817);

The 15 July 1979 USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Edict "On a Procedure for Implementing the USSR Law 'On USSR Citizenship'" (VEDOMOSTI USSR SUPREME SOVIET, 1979, No. 25, p 436);

The 6 January 1981 USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Edict "On an Affirmation of the Rules on a Procedure for Examining in the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Questions Relating to USSR Citizenship" ("Record of the Meeting of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium," 1981, No. 33, p 3);

And the 13 April 1987 USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Edict "On an Amendment to the Rules on a Procedure for Examining in the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Questions Relating to USSR Citizenship" ("Record of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium," 1987, No. 61, p 63).

4. Insofar as they do not contradict the USSR Law "On USSR Citizenship," the existing acts of legislation on citizenship of the USSR and union republics are applied until the introduction of legislation on citizenship of the USSR and union republics in accordance with the aforementioned Law.

5. For the USSR Council of Ministers to introduce by 1 January 1991 acts of the USSR Government in accordance with the USSR Law "On USSR Citizenship" and to provide for the examination or repeal by ministries and state committees and departments of the USSR of their normative acts which contradict the aforementioned Law.

6. For the supreme soviets of the union and autonomous republics to introduce union and autonomous republic legislation in accordance with the USSR Law "On USSR Citizenship."

[Signed] A. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet.
Moscow, the Kremlin, 23 May 1990.

Law on USSR Citizenship Published

WA1106192090 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 1 Jun 90 pp 1, 4

[USSR Law "On USSR Citizenship"]

[Text] USSR citizenship determines the standing political and legal bond between the person and the Soviet state. This bond finds its expression in their mutual rights and responsibilities.

In the USSR every person has a right to citizenship. No one may arbitrarily be deprived of their citizenship or the right to change citizenship. In the form of its organs and officials, the Soviet state is responsible to the citizens of the USSR, and the citizens of the USSR are responsible to the state.

I. General Provisions

Article 1. USSR Citizenship

Union citizenship is established in the USSR. Every citizen of a union republic is simultaneously a citizen of the USSR. Every citizen of an autonomous republic is simultaneously a citizen of the union republic to which the autonomous republic belongs and a citizen of the USSR.

Article 2. Equal Citizenship

Citizenship is equal for all Soviet citizens irrespective of the grounds for its acquisition or of citizenship in any of the republics.

Citizens of the USSR are equal before the law irrespective of origin, social and ownership status, racial and national origin, sex, education, language, attitude toward religion, political and other convictions, type and nature of occupation, place of residence, period of residence in a given locality, and other circumstances.

Equality of USSR citizens is guaranteed by the USSR and the union and autonomous republics in all spheres of economic, political, social, and cultural life.

Article 3. Legislation of the USSR and the Union and Autonomous Republics on Soviet Citizenship

Legislation of the USSR and the union and autonomous republics on Soviet citizenship consists of the present Law, adopted on the basis of the USSR Constitution, and other legislative acts of the USSR and union and autonomous republics concerning Soviet citizenship published in accordance with it.

Article 4. USSR Citizenship

The following are USSR citizens:

Persons who were USSR citizens on the day the present Law came into effect;

And persons who have acquired USSR citizenship in accordance with the present Law.

Article 5. Union Republic Citizenship

Union republic citizenship is defined by the Law on Union Republic Citizenship.

Each citizen of a union republic on the territory of any union republic enjoys equal rights with its citizens and bears equal responsibilities with them.

Article 6. Autonomous Republic Citizenship

Autonomous republic citizenship is defined by the Law on Autonomous Republic Citizenship.

Each citizen of an autonomous republic on the territory of any union or autonomous republic enjoys equal rights with its citizens and bears equal responsibilities with them.

Article 7. Preservation of Citizenship Under Conditions of Marriage and Divorce

The entry into marriage of a male or female USSR citizen with a person who has foreign citizenship or is a stateless person and the dissolution of that marriage do not entail a change in the citizenship of the spouses.

A change in citizenship by one of the spouses does not entail a change in the citizenship of the other spouse.

Article 8. Preservation of USSR Citizenship by Persons Living Abroad

A period of living abroad by a USSR citizen does not entail the revocation of USSR, union, or autonomous republic citizenship.

Article 9. State Protection of USSR Citizens Abroad

USSR citizens abroad enjoy the protection and patronage of the Soviet state.

The Soviet state, its diplomatic missions, consular institutions, and their officials are obligated to ensure that citizens of the USSR have the opportunity to avail themselves in full measure of all the rights granted them by the legislation of the country they are visiting, by international treaties that the USSR or the union republic and the country being visited subscribe to, and by international custom; to defend their rights according to the procedure established by legislation and their legitimate interests; and to take measures where necessary to restore those rights of Soviet citizens which have been violated.

Article 10. Inadmissibility of Extraditing a USSR Citizen to a Foreign State

A USSR citizen may not be extradited to a foreign state.

Article 11. Nonrecognition of Foreign Citizenship for a USSR Citizen

Foreign citizenship is not recognized for a person who is a USSR citizen.

Article 12. Stateless Persons

Persons living on USSR territory who are not USSR citizens and do not have proof of foreign citizenship are considered stateless persons.

II. Acquiring USSR Citizenship

Article 13. Grounds for Acquiring Soviet Citizenship

USSR citizenship is acquired:

1) at birth;

2) as a result of naturalization as a Soviet citizen;

3) on grounds stipulated by the USSR's international treaties;

4) or on other grounds stipulated by the present Law.

Article 14. Citizenship of Children Whose Parents Are USSR Citizens

A child whose parents were both USSR citizens at the moment of its birth is a USSR citizen irrespective of whether he was born on USSR territory or outside of the borders of the USSR.

Article 15. Citizenship of Children, One of Whose Parents Is a USSR Citizen

When the parents have different citizenships and one of them was a USSR citizen at the time of the child's birth, the child is a USSR citizen:

1) if he was born on USSR territory;

2) or if he was born outside the borders of the USSR but the parents or one of them was residing at that time on USSR territory.

Where the parents have different citizenships and one of them was a USSR citizen at the time of the child's birth, if at this time both parents were residing outside the borders of the USSR, the citizenship of a child born outside the borders of the USSR is determined by agreement of the parents expressed in written form.

Where one of the parents of a child was a USSR citizen at the time of the child's birth and the other was a stateless person or was unknown, the child is a USSR citizen irrespective of the place of birth.

In the event that the paternity of a child born to a mother who is a stateless person is established, and the father is

acknowledged to be a USSR citizen, the child becomes a USSR citizen so long as he has not reached 14 years of age, irrespective of the place of his birth.

Article 16. Acquisition of USSR Citizenship by Children of Stateless Persons

A child born on USSR territory to stateless persons who are residing in the USSR is a USSR citizen.

Article 17. Citizenship of Children Whose Parents Are Unknown

A child located on USSR territory whose parents are both unknown is a USSR citizen.

Article 18. Naturalization as a USSR citizen

Upon petition, foreign citizens and stateless persons may be naturalized as USSR citizens in accordance with the present Law irrespective of origin, racial and national origin, sex, education, language, attitude toward religion, political and other convictions, and place of residence.

A petition for naturalization as a USSR citizen is denied if the petitioning person appeals for the forcible overthrow or alteration of the Soviet state and the social system secured by the USSR Constitution; if he carries out actions causing damage to state security, the maintenance of public order, or the health or morals of the population or advocates enmity or racial and national discrimination; or if he is connected with terrorist activities.

Article 19. Restoration of USSR Citizenship

A person who previously held Soviet citizenship may, upon his petitioning, be restored to USSR citizenship.

III. Revocation of USSR Citizenship

Article 20. Grounds for the Discontinuance of USSR Citizenship

USSR citizenship is discontinued:

1) as a consequence of renunciation of USSR citizenship;

2) as a consequence of loss of USSR citizenship;

3) as a consequence of revocation of USSR citizenship;

4) on grounds stipulated by the USSR's international treaties;

5) or on other grounds stipulated by the present Law.

Discontinuance of USSR citizenship entails discontinuance of union republic and autonomous republic citizenship.

Article 21. Renunciation of USSR Citizenship

Renunciation of USSR citizenship is permitted upon petition by a person in accordance with procedure established by the present Law.

Renunciation of USSR citizenship may be denied if the person petitioning for renunciation has unfulfilled obligations to the state or property obligations involving significant interests of citizens or of state and public organizations.

Renunciation of USSR citizenship is not allowed if criminal proceedings have been instituted against the person petitioning for renunciation or if there is a court sentence in effect and due to be carried out with respect to him, or if the person's renunciation of USSR citizenship contradicts the interests of state security of the USSR.

Article 22. Loss of USSR Citizenship

USSR citizenship is lost:

1) as a consequence of a person's performance of military service or security service in a police force, organs of justice or in other organs of state power and administration in a foreign country;

2) if a person residing abroad has not registered with the consul for five years without a valid reason;

3) or if USSR citizenship was obtained as a result of the presentation of deliberately false information or documents.

Loss of USSR citizenship takes place at the time a given instance is registered by an authorized state organ indicated in Articles 35 and 36 of the present Law.

Article 23. Revocation of USSR Citizenship

Revocation of USSR citizenship may take place only with regard to a person living abroad when he has committed an action which causes significant damage to state interests or state security of the USSR.

The revocation of USSR citizenship does not entail a change in the citizenship of a spouse and children.

IV. Citizenship of Children Under Conditions of a Change in the Citizenship of the Parents and Under Conditions of Adoption

Article 24. Change in the Citizenship of Children in the Event That the Parents Change Their Citizenship

Where the parents change their citizenship, as a consequence of which both become citizens of the USSR or both renounce USSR citizenship, the citizenship of their children who have not reached 14 years of age changes accordingly.

If only one of a child's parents is known, then the citizenship of a child who has not reached 14 years of age changes accordingly when that parent changes nationality.

Article 25. Maintenance of USSR Citizenship by a Child Under Wardship or Guardianship

If both parents or the sole parent of a child living on USSR territory renounce USSR citizenship and do not take part in the rearing of the child, who has been put under the wardship or guardianship of citizens of the USSR, the child will maintain USSR citizenship upon petition by the parents, the ward, or the guardian.

Article 26. Acquisition of USSR Citizenship by Children in the Event That One of Their Parents Acquires USSR Citizenship

If one of the parents becomes a USSR citizen and the other remains a foreign citizen, the child may acquire USSR citizenship upon petition by the parent who has acquired USSR citizenship.

If one of the parents becomes a USSR citizen and the other remains a stateless person, a child living on USSR territory becomes a USSR citizen.

If one of the parents becomes a USSR citizen and the other remains a stateless person, a child living outside the borders of the USSR may acquire USSR citizenship upon petition by the parent who has acquired USSR citizenship.

Article 27. Maintenance of USSR Citizenship by Children in the Event That One of the Parents Renounces USSR Citizenship

If one of the parents renounces USSR citizenship and the other remains a USSR citizen, the child maintains USSR citizenship. Upon petition by the parent who is renouncing USSR citizenship, such a child may be allowed to renounce USSR citizenship.

Article 28. Acquisition of USSR Citizenship by Children in the Event of Adoption

A child who is a foreign citizen or a stateless person and is being adopted by USSR citizens becomes a USSR citizen.

A child who is a foreign citizen and is adopted by a married couple, one of whom is a USSR citizen and the other a stateless person, becomes a USSR citizen.

A child who is a stateless person and is adopted by a married couple, one of whom is a USSR citizen, becomes a USSR citizen.

A child who is a foreign citizen and is adopted by a married couple, one of whom is a USSR citizen and the other a foreign citizen, becomes a USSR citizen upon the agreement of those who are adopting the child.

Article 29. Maintenance of USSR Citizenship by Children in the Event of Adoption

A child who is a USSR citizen and is adopted by foreign citizens or is adopted by a married couple, one of whom is a USSR citizen and the other a foreign citizen, maintains USSR citizenship. At the petition of those who are adopting the child, such a child may be allowed to renounce USSR citizenship.

A child who is a USSR citizen and is adopted by stateless persons or is adopted by a married couple, one of whom is a USSR citizen and the other a stateless person, maintains USSR citizenship.

Article 30. Necessity of the Children's Agreement To Change Their Citizenship

A change in the citizenship of children ages 14 to 18, in the event that their parents change citizenship or that they are adopted, may only occur with the agreement of the children according to the procedure stipulated in Article 38 of the present Law.

V. Organs Making Decisions on Question of Soviet Citizenship

Article 31. Organs Ruling on Questions of Soviet Citizenship

In the USSR the organs which rule on questions of citizenship are the president of the USSR and the presidiums of the supreme soviets or higher state officials of union and autonomous republics.

Article 32. Powers of the President of the USSR

The president of the USSR rules:

On the naturalization as a USSR citizen of foreign citizens residing abroad and stateless persons who have petitioned the president of the USSR in the proper fashion;

On the naturalization as a USSR citizen of foreign citizens and stateless persons and on the renunciation of USSR citizenship by Soviet citizens if there was an earlier decision made in accordance with USSR legislation with respect to their citizenship;

On the restoration of USSR citizenship;

On the renunciation of USSR citizenship by Soviet citizens residing abroad who have petitioned the president of the USSR in the proper fashion;

And on the revocation of USSR citizenship.

Questions of citizenship affecting the interests of a union or autonomous republic are decided by the president of the USSR with regard for the opinion of the appropriate republic.

With the goal of defending human rights or the interests of the USSR, the president of the USSR has the right to personally examine any question of USSR citizenship.

Article 33. Powers of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of a Union Republic or of a Higher State Official of a Union Republic

Outside the bounds of the powers of the president of the USSR stipulated in Article 32 of the present Law, the presidium of the supreme soviet of a union republic or a higher state official of a union republic rules on the following questions of Soviet citizenship:

On the naturalization as a union republic citizen and, as a result, as a USSR citizen, of foreign citizens and stateless persons residing on the territory of a given republic;

On the naturalization as a union republic citizen and, as a result, as a USSR citizen, of foreign citizens and stateless persons living abroad who have petitioned in proper fashion the presidium of the supreme soviet of a union republic or the higher state official of a union republic on the territory where they wish to settle;

On the renunciation of union republic citizenship and, as a result, of USSR citizenship, of USSR citizens residing on the territory of a given republic;

On the renunciation of union republic citizenship and, as a result, of USSR citizenship, of USSR citizens residing abroad who have petitioned in proper fashion the presidium of the supreme soviet of a union republic or the higher state official of a union republic on the territory where they resided before they moved from the USSR;

And on the maintenance of union republic citizenship and, as a result, of USSR citizenship, in events stipulated by Article 25 of the present Law.

Article 34. Powers of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of an Autonomous Republic or of a Higher State Official of an Autonomous Republic

The presidium of the supreme soviet of an autonomous republic or a higher state official of an autonomous republic rules on questions of autonomous republic citizenship on the basis of agreements and treaties which are concluded between the proper union and autonomous republics.

Article 35. Powers of the Organs of Internal Affairs

The USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, the ministries of internal affairs of the union and autonomous republics, and the administrations and departments of internal affairs of the executive committees of the soviets of people's deputies:

Accept declarations on questions of Soviet citizenship from persons residing in the USSR and send them, together with the necessary documents, for examination by the president of the USSR or the presidium of a supreme soviet or higher state official of a union or autonomous republic;

Determine whether persons residing in the USSR have USSR citizenship;

And register the loss of USSR citizenship by persons residing on USSR territory.

Article 36. Powers of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, of Ministries of Foreign Affairs of the Union Republics, of Soviet Diplomatic Missions, and of Consular Institutions

The USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the ministries of foreign affairs of the union republics, Soviet diplomatic missions, and consular institutions:

Accept from persons residing abroad declarations on questions of Soviet citizenship and send them, together with the necessary documents, for examination by the president of the USSR or the presidium of the supreme soviet or higher state official of a union or autonomous republic;

Determine whether persons residing abroad have USSR citizenship;

Register the loss of USSR citizenship by persons residing abroad;

And conduct registration of USSR citizens residing abroad.

VI. Execution of Declarations and Representations on Questions of Soviet Citizenship for Examination

Article 37. Procedure for Submitting Declarations on Questions of Citizenship

Declarations on questions of citizenship are submitted as appropriate to the address of the president of the USSR or the presidium of the supreme soviet or higher state official of a union or autonomous republic via the organs of internal affairs at the declarer's place of residence, and persons residing abroad submit declarations via the appropriate Soviet diplomatic missions or consular institutions.

A person who is a citizen of a state with which the USSR has completed a treaty to prevent dual citizenship is obligated to present a document testifying to that state's attitude toward the citizen's intention of changing citizenship.

Article 38. The Form of Declarations on Citizenship

A petition on naturalization as a Soviet citizen, restoration of Soviet citizenship, or renunciation of Soviet citizenship is examined at the written request of the declarer. Petitions with regard to persons who have not yet reached 18 years of age are examined at the request of their legal representatives, as certified by a notary or, abroad, certified by a Soviet diplomatic mission or consular institution.

Submission of a petition on naturalization as a Soviet citizen, restoration of Soviet citizenship, or renunciation of Soviet citizenship for children of 14-18 years of age requires their agreement, which must be expressed in written form and certified by a notary or, abroad, certified by a Soviet diplomatic mission or consular institution.

Submission of a petition on the renunciation of USSR citizenship for an underage child, one of whose parents remains a USSR citizen, also requires presentation of a declaration by that parent expressing his attitude toward

the child's renunciation of USSR citizenship. Such a declaration must be certified by a notary or, abroad, certified by a Soviet diplomatic mission or consular institution.

If the declarer cannot sign the declaration because of illiteracy or as a result of physical disability, the declaration may be signed at his request by another person, and a corresponding notation will be made on the declaration by an organ of internal affairs or, abroad, certified by a Soviet diplomatic mission or consular institution.

Article 39. Determination of USSR Citizenship

A declaration concerning a person's USSR citizenship is submitted to the organ of internal affairs at the place of residence of that person and, in the case of persons residing abroad, to the appropriate Soviet diplomatic mission or consular institution.

When USSR citizenship has been determined, one applies the acts of legislation of the USSR and union and autonomous republics and the rules of the USSR's international treaties which were valid at the moment that the circumstances connected with the person's USSR citizenship occurred.

Article 40. Representation on the Revocation of USSR Citizenship

Representation on the revocation of USSR citizenship is made by the state organs of the USSR, the union and autonomous republics, and by Soviet diplomatic missions or consular institutions via the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Article 41. Procedure for Registering Declarations on Questions of Citizenship

Registration of declarations on questions of USSR citizenship is performed at the personal request of the declarer by the organs of internal affairs in his place of residence or, with regard to persons residing abroad, by the appropriate diplomatic missions or consular institutions.

Where there are valid reasons, the organs of internal affairs, Soviet diplomatic missions, and consular institutions should register materials on citizenship for declarations which have been transmitted by other persons or through the mail.

Article 42. Conclusions Concerning Declarations on Questions of Citizenship

An organ of internal affairs, a Soviet diplomatic mission, or a consular institution performing registration of a declaration on questions of citizenship gives a justified conclusion of its own on the declaration.

The USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and the USSR Committee for State Security send their conclusions concerning declarations or representations on questions of citizenship and other necessary materials to the address of the president of the USSR.

The ministries of internal affairs, ministries of foreign affairs, and committees for state security of the union republics and the ministries of internal affairs and committees for state security of the autonomous republics send their conclusions concerning declarations or representations on questions of citizenship and other necessary materials to the presidiums of the supreme soviets or higher state officials of the appropriate union and autonomous republics.

The councils of ministers of union and autonomous republics will present to the president of the USSR, the presidium of the supreme soviet or a higher state official of the appropriate union or autonomous republic justified conclusions on the advisability of naturalizing as a USSR citizen or restoring USSR citizenship to each declarer, along with his provisions for work, housing, and other needs in the republic.

In the conclusions concerning declarations on renunciation of USSR citizenship, a report is also made of information regarding the declarer's unfulfilled obligations to the state or his property obligations involving significant interests of citizens or of state, cooperative, and other public organizations, and of criminal proceedings instituted against him or of a court sentence in effect and due to be carried out with respect to him, or if the given person's renunciation of USSR citizenship contradicts the interests of state security of the USSR.

Article 43. Preliminary Examination of Declarations and Representations in the Commission for Questions of Citizenship Under the President of the USSR

The president of the USSR forms a Commission for Questions of Citizenship for preliminary examination of questions of citizenship indicated in Article 32 of the present Law.

Upon examination of the declarations and representations on questions of citizenship, the commission thoroughly evaluates the arguments of the declarer, the content of the representation, the conclusions of the state organs and public organizations, and other documents and properly registered evidence.

The commission also takes into consideration the opinion of the council of ministers of that union or autonomous republic where the person intends to settle concerning the advisability of his naturalization as a Soviet citizen or restoration to citizenship along with opportunities for work, housing, and other needs in the republic. For a case under its execution, the commission has the right to obtain on demand materials and documents of the appropriate state organs and public organizations, which are to present the needed information within the time period established by the commission.

The commission makes proposals on each declaration or representation for examination by the president of the USSR.

The decision of the commission is registered on a record which is signed by all the members of the commission who have taken part in the meeting.

Article 44. Ruling on Questions of Citizenship by the President of the USSR

The president of the USSR publishes edicts on questions of citizenship.

Changes in citizenship go into effect the day an edict of the president of the USSR is published so long as it is not established otherwise in the edict.

As a rule, a repeat declaration on a question of citizenship is examined one year after the previous decision on this question. In the event of the appearance of circumstances which are significant to the case and which were not and could not have been known to the declarer, a repeat declaration may be examined before that time.

Article 45. Deadlines for Examining Declarations on Questions of Citizenship

The deadline for examining declarations on questions of citizenship may not exceed one year.

VII. Implementation of Rulings on Questions of Citizenship

Article 46. Organs Implementing Rulings on Questions of Citizenship

The implementation of rulings on questions of citizenship with regard to persons residing in the USSR is entrusted to the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, the ministries of internal affairs of the union and autonomous republics, and the administrations and departments of internal affairs of the executive committees of the soviets of people's deputies and, with regard to persons residing abroad, to the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, the ministries of internal affairs of the union republics, Soviet diplomatic missions, and consular institutions.

Article 47. Issuance of Identification Papers and Residency Permits

Persons who have Soviet citizenship in the manner established by law are issued the identification papers of a USSR citizen by organs of internal affairs, Soviet diplomatic missions, or consular institutions. A notation is made in the documents of children who have not reached 16 years of age concerning their USSR citizenship.

Persons residing in the USSR whose Soviet citizenship has been discontinued are issued residency permits by the organs of internal affairs.

Article 48. Monitoring Implementation of Rulings on Questions of Citizenship

Monitoring implementation of rulings on questions of citizenship is carried out by the Commission on Questions of Citizenship under the president of the USSR as well as by other organs ruling on questions of citizenship.

VIII. Appealing Rulings on Question of Citizenship

Article 49. Appealing Rulings on Questions of Citizenship

Rulings on questions of citizenship made by the presidiums of the supreme soviets or higher officials of union and autonomous republics may be appealed to the president of the USSR.

Article 50. Appealing the Illegal Actions of Officials on Questions of Citizenship

An unjustified refusal to receive a declaration on questions of citizenship, the violation of deadlines for examining declarations, as well as other illegal actions of officials violating the procedure for examining cases on citizenship and the procedure for implementing rulings on questions of citizenship may be appealed in the manner established by law to an official placed higher in the chain of command or to court.

IX. International Treaties

Article 51. Application of International Treaties

Where an international treaty of the USSR has established other rules than those which are contained in the present Law, the rules of the international treaty apply.

[Signed] M. Gorbachev, president of the USSR.
Moscow, the Kremlin, 23 May 1990.

Supreme Soviet Resolution on Draft Law Viewed

WA0606141990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Jun 90 Second Edition p 5

[Decree of the USSR Supreme Soviet "On the Draft Law on Public Associations"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet hereby decrees:

1. To approve on the first reading the basic provisions of the draft law on public associations.

2. To publish the draft law on public associations in the press for discussion.

3. The USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Legislation is to generalize the remarks and suggestions expressed during the course of the discussion of the draft law and, with the participation of the commission formed by the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet for this question and other committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet and permanent commissions of the chambers, to complete work on the draft law taking into account the remarks and suggestions expressed by USSR people's deputies

and those made during the course of the discussion, and to submit the reworked draft of the law for the consideration of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

A. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Moscow, The Kremlin, 30 May 1990

May Day Red Square Disturbances Viewed

PM2305175090 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 19 20-27 May 90 p 6

[Natalya Davydova feature, incorporating interviews with Moscow City Soviet Executive Committee Chairman Yuriy Luzhkov and Anarcho-Syndicalist Confederation leader Andrey Isayev: "May Day in Red Square"]

[Excerpts] The events in Moscow's Red Square on the Day of Workers' Solidarity have been commented upon by almost all Soviet newspapers. It is time "Moscow News" had its say. Now that emotions have calmed down we can try to assess the events without prejudice.

Says Yuriy Luzhkov, Chairman of Moscow City Soviet Executive Committee: [passage omitted]

What did I find particularly objectionable? First of all, lack of respect for the president. Our pluralism, freedom of expression and political activity have obviously been taken too far. Nor did I like the anti-communist slogans. Not because I am a communist. The party leadership has taken the lead in perestroika, and for all the ups and downs in the complicated and stormy political situation, for all the correct or incorrect decisions made, the general tendency is towards a deeper democratization of the society. It would be absurd to deny that. But traditional and new political forces ought to compete for influence without vulgar abuse of the political structures existing in our society. They are still there. Perhaps they will be changed. But the changes must be effected calmly.

Any political activity is admissible as long as it is not inhuman or fascist. All activists must be tolerant of one another. No firm foundation can be built on unrestrained, loud and hateful repudiation of what has been our society's modus vivendi for a long time. However imperfect our life may be, it is better to put all our efforts into building something better. Instead, people are trying to assert themselves through the kind of abuse that would be totally unacceptable in a civilized society. That was what made me so depressed.

Why Didn't You Leave Then?

I believe that what happened reflected, in a magnified and perhaps distorted way, the objective processes taking place in Moscow and, perhaps, the whole country. One must try to understand the picture as a whole. That's why I didn't leave. The May Day demonstration in Moscow ought to be instructive. Of course, I would say I was in no festive mood after the demonstration.

View From the Marching Column

Says Andrey Isayev, leader of the Anarcho-Syndicalist Confederation:

The column of Anarcho-Syndicalists, about 130 people in all, entered Red Square under our black flag at the very moment the "head" of the democratic column reached the Mausoleum. One could hear people trying to chant something when the music stopped playing. Then we saw the people standing at the top of the Mausoleum leave abruptly. To begin with, some hotheads in our midst decided the leadership had been upset by our black flags. People around chanted, "Long live Lithuania!", "Down with the blockade of Lithuania!", Down with the CPSU!", "Down with Marxism-Leninism!". But I didn't hear abuse of any particular politician. As to the comments and assessment made afterwards, they seemed rather surprising. One would expect some embittered people to turn up at the demonstration, and the democratic column is naturally dissatisfied with the government. We understand how nervous and frantic people's attitude are today.

[Davydova] Never before had a mass demonstration behaved so bluntly.

[Isayev] had it been normal practice here for whoever feels like it to turn out on the 1st of May with whatever slogans they like, nothing of the kind would have happened. People greedily seized opportunities they had been denied for so long. But the main reason was this: the democratic column was deliberately made to act as the opposition. We had been kept waiting at the side of the square for the "workers' meeting" to take place, and were then allowed to march through Red Square, but with no chance to hold debate, no one listening to our point of view. We were separated from the Mausoleum by a solid row of soldiers. What if they wore dress uniform? The music was playing so loudly one had the impression it was to drawn the chanting of the crowd. We were allowed to march past, but we were not supposed to be heard. We did not feel like taking part in a dumb show. We did not want to demonstrate submission. We wanted to demonstrate a different viewpoint. How? In the given situation the only way was the shout. also, to make them understand our viewpoint was difference, our chants grew increasingly aggressive and bitter. Many got carried away chanting "Down with the CPSU!", "Down with the KGB!", "Down with Leninism!" in front of the Mausoleum.

[Davydova] Didn't the leaders' walk-out calm the demonstrators?

[Isayev] Their walk-out exacerbated the situation further. The leadership seemed to be saying: if you keep on shouting such things we won't listen to you at all. On May Day in Red Square two epochs confronted each other and clashed. On the one hand, there was the usual officialdom, bravura, stone effiges behind the Mausoleum, red flags and streamers. On the other, the crowd

with multicoloured flags. Homemade slogans and placards should have been shown.

[Davydova] By the Government?

[Isyayev] As an anarchist, I would not dare to advise statesmen. But many demonstrators felt a strange elation because they thought they had managed to shoo Gorbachev off the Mausoleum. It is true, Constitutional Democrats did not take part in the demonstration and condemned others for abusing their privilege and spoiling the boliday.

In my opinion, both sides out to learn from what happened. I also think the President or a cabinet minister should speak up openly about the incident. Their words, however critical, would be well received by the people. For the time being the feeling of confrontation remains: "us" v. "them."

CPSU Democratic Platform Holds Conference

LD2905100490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2022 GMT 28 May 90

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] The second conference of supporters of the Democratic Platform of the CPSU has taken place in Moscow. Delegates from party organizations and party clubs in Moscow and Moscow Oblast took part in it. They deemed it essential to strive for the adoption of a completely new party course at the 28th CPSU Congress. The main aim, in their view, should be building a genuine democratic socialism. The tactics of the Democratic Platform for the 28th congress were also discussed. A section of delegates suggested remaining in the party even if right-wing forces win at the congress. The majority think that in this event supporters of the Democratic Platform should leave the CPSU. Final tactics for the Democratic Platform will be determined in the middle of June at an all-union conference. [video shows meeting under way]

Labor Protection Association Formed

LD0506101590

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 2330 GMT on 4 June carries a five-minute report by correspondent Sergey Omelchenko on the formation of a new all-union association for labor protection, to which about 500,000 scientists engineers, and technical workers belong. He interviews some of them on its purpose, which is to speed up the introduction of ecologically clean technology and raise safety levels at enterprises. An unnamed interviewee says, that one miner's life is lost per 100,000 tonnes of coal mined, and so far, little money has been spent directly on mine safety. The association has the status to be influential.

Farmers Union Founding Congress Opens

LD1106212690 Moscow TASS in English 2055 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 12 TASS—A constituent Congress of a USSR Farmers Union began here on Monday. The main item on the agenda is the creation of an all-Union socio-political organization which is called upon to represent farmers' interests.

The Congress is being attended by more than 2,000 delegates representing all regions of the country.

A report on ways to renew the agrarian sector under the conditions of a multi-mode economy and a radical economic reform was delivered by Ivan Kukhar, chairman of the organising committee of the congress and chairman of the All-Union Council of Collective Farms.

Acute and profound contradictions continue to pile up in the agro-industrial sector, he said. Without resolving them it is impossible to stabilize the socio-economic and political situation in the country. Bad social conditions give rise to unceasing migration of the rural population to towns.

Today's phenomena are rooted in recognising the state property as the only acceptable and dominant one, Kukhar believes.

This resulted in an utter alientation of the worker from property and turning him into a day labourer. The agrarian sector of the economjy was for decades viewed upon as a kind of domestic colony, from which means for the development of towns and industry were taken.

The activities of the Farmers' Union which is being created, Kukhar said, should be based on socio-economic transformation and spiritual revival of the countrywide, the ensurance of equal and free development of diverse forms of ownership and economic management, the upholding and protection of socio-economic, legal and political interests of farmers.

Kukhar defined as the main directions of the activities of the Farmers' Union to refine production relations, to ensure scientific and technological progress in the branches of the agro-industrial sector and to solve the social problems of the countryside.

This must be done in cooperation with state agencies and other public and socio-political organisations, he added.

The USSR Farmers' Union will actively participate in shaping the agrarian policy of the state and in implementing it.

The Farmers' Union will nominate its candidate for election to the councils of people's deputies at all levels and to form agrarian groups and among the elected deputies and through them uphold farmers' interests in legislative bodies.

The USSR farmers' congress will continues its work on Tuesday.

Medvedev, Others Visit Victory Exhibition

LD0206195390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 2 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] As you possibly know, a exhibition devoted to defenders of the Fatherland has been launched in the Central Exhibition Hall. It has been prepared for the 45th anniversary of the Great Victory. Today, the exhibition was visited by Comrades Medvedev, Girenko, Manayenkov, Stroyev, and Usmanov. [passage omitted]

Central Committee Greets Cinematographers

PM0606122390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Jun 90 Second Edition p 1

[CPSU Central Committee message to Sixth Congress of USSR Cinematographers]

[Text] To the Delegates and Guests of the Sixth USSR Congress of Cinematographers

We cordially greet delegates to and guests of the Sixth USSR Congress of Cinematographers—representatives of the multinational detachment of Soviet movie people.

We urge you to take an even more active part in the spiritual revival of society and in resolving the fundamental tasks involved in the revolutionary renewal of our society.

We wish the congress successful work and the constructive resolution of professional and creative problems.

[Signed] CPSU Central Committee

World Aid Sought for Chernobyl Aftermath

LD2605110590 Moscow TASS in English 1826 GMT 24 May 90

[By TASS diplomatic correspondent]

[Text] Moscow May 24 TASS—A draft resolution on international cooperation to eliminate the consequences of the Chernobyl nuclear disaster was put to consideration by the first regular session of Ecosoc [United Nations Economic and Social Council], currently under way in New York. It was submitted by delegations from the Soviet Union, Belorussia, and the Ukraine.

The draft provides for elaborating a relevant international programme and for dispatching an intersectoral mission to the afflicted areas of the Soviet Union.

During the session 22 countries supported the draft. However the draft resolution was submitted shortly before the start of the session and some countries were not prepared for its detailed discussion.

As a result Ecosoc decided on May 18 to include the issue in the agenda of the Ecosoc summer session and to submit a draft resolution for its consideration.

"This issue was posed before the international community and the UN system in this way because of the extreme complexity and scope of the accident's consequences," a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman told TASS today.

"The accident at Chernobyl posed before the country new, highly complex, large-scale problems that affect practically all sides of life," he continued. "Huge resources and the efforts of the country's leading scientists and specialists were directed to this end, which helped prevent catastrophic consequences from the Chernobyl fall-out.

However it should be acknowledged that the problems today remain as acute as ever. According to new data obtained from extensive investigations, the scale of the fall-out at national level and the Chernobyl phenomenon itself, including its international aspects, was underestimated.

"In terms of its long-term consequences, the accident at Chernobyl is the largest technological catastrophe of the 20th century. This national disaster affected hundreds of thousands of people and damaged the health of millions of people on vast areas within the zone of radioactive fallout," the spokesman said.

"Vast populated areas of Belorussia, the Ukraine and some western regions of the Russian Federation, including some 7 million hectares of farm land and more than 2.5 million hectares of forests, were contaminated."

"Having admitted that the measures adopted before were insufficient, the USSR Council of Ministers drafted and adopted the state programme of urgent measures for 1990-92 to eliminate the consequences of the accident," the spokesman continued.

"A total of 26 billion roubles was set aside for these purposes over the next three years. Large-scale programmes were drafted by the Councils of Ministers of Belorussia, the Russian Federation, and the Ukraine.

On April 25 the USSR Supreme Soviet passed a special resolution on Chernobyl that envisages drafting a single, long-term state programme to protect the Soviet population from the consequences of the Chernobyl catastrophe, as well as setting up of a nationwide committee to eliminate the consequences of the accident under the USSR Council of Minister's State Commission on Emergencies.

"The supreme bodies of legislative and executive power in Belorussia and the Ukraine asked the world community for aid to overcome the consequences of this disaster," the Foreign Ministry representative said. "In this context the missions of the USSR, Belorussia, and the Ukraine in New York, Geneva, Vienna and Paris and their delegations at the first session of Ecosoc proposed

elaborating a programme for international cooperation on Chernobyl, which would pool the efforts of the international community.

Body Set Up To Monitor Human Rights Complaints

PM0106115690 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 May 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Unattributed report: "Public Monitoring"]

[Text] The Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation public commission for humanitarian questions and human rights has set up a Public Reception Center for the investigation of Soviet citizens' complaints and statements relating to instances where the said appeals concern Soviet legislation and administrative practice in the observance of rights stipulated in the Soviet Union's international commitments (the Helsinki Final Act, the Final Document of the Vienna CSCE Meeting, and international pacts on human rights). The Public Reception Center is headed by law professor B.L. Nazarov, first deputy chairman of the commission. The beginning of work by the Public Reception Center revealed the main thrust of its activity. The commission members will carefully study the substance of appeals, make social and legal recommendations, and where necessary bring them to the attention of the appropriate law enforcement organs. Thus the appeals of citizens who cannot obtain satisfaction from official bodies will be under public monitoring.

Tension Increases in Coal-Mining Areas

LD0206135390 Moscow World Service in Russian 0930 GMT 2 Jun 90

[From the "Soviet Chronicle" feature of the "Soviet Union Day by Day program; report attributed to Interfax]

[Text] The situation in the country's coal-mining regions has again become tense. The strike committees of Kuzbass, Siberia, have become active, rallies are being held in Donbass, Ukraine, and miners in Karaganda, Kazakhstan, voted against going on strike by a narrow margin of one vote. The situation that had arisen was discussed in Moscow at a roundtable meeting attended by miners and leaders of the industry. Lev Ryabev, deputy head of the Soviet Government, said that many demands put forward by the miners have been fulfilled. Over a year, their wages have increased by 15 percent on average, and the construction of housing has expanded. At the same time, miners said that the demand for allowing them a prolonged 57-day leave has not been fulfilled. They stressed that prices for coal should be raised, otherwise the economic independence of mines could not become a reality.

International 'Management' Magazine Presented

LD0306100490

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1730 GMT on 2 June broadcasts a two-minute report by correspondent Aleksandr Kuzin on a presentation in Moscow of the international magazine PROBLEMY. TEORIYA I PRAKTIKA UPRAVLENIYA (problems, theory and practice of management). Kuzin reports that this is a specialized magazine set up by the international scientific research institute of management problems where specialists from the countries of East Europe, Mongolia, and Cuba are working. The magazine contains analytical materials covering the main trends in management in different countries. The magazine's editor-in-chief (Sylen) speaks about the editorial office's plans which include promoting an exchange of management experience and establishing mutual understanding among specialists and scientists from different countries. The magazine is to be published in English and German.

Economic

USSR Industrial Output Continues To Fall

LD1106135590 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] According to today's figures from the USSR State Committee for Statistics, the situation which has developed in industry since the beginning of this year did not change during May, the last month of spring. Marketable output is falling. The details of the report from the State Committee for Statistics surely make all sensible people ask themselves how low these figures have to fall and for how long before the opponents of the concept of a market economy finally realize that there is no alternative to switching over to a regulated market in this country.

Abalkin Interviewed on Switch to Market Economy

PM0606094190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Jun 90 Second Edition p 2—FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

[Interview with L.I. Abalkin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, by correspondent A. Fedotov under the rubric "Our Interviews"; place, date not given: "Market: Emotions and Reality"—first three paragraphs are PRAVDA introduction]

[Text] "Shock without therapy"—this is the mirthless nickname that public opinion has given to the government program defining the economy's transfer to a regulated market.

Well, the human reaction by no means always tallies with the "official course," even if this course has, in principle, been chosen correctly. The strain and skepticism of the recent difficult months have also affected confidence in the government's concept. The first conclusion is that the program was needed in order to

sharply raise retail prices and to patch up the worn-out state budget. The first, immediate result is a consumer barrage that has thoroughly cleared out the already undernourished stores.

How have "we come to such a pass"? How is it that a program that promises changes for the better has given rise to so many contradictory rumors? Leonid Ivanovich Abalkin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, answers a PRAVDA correspondent's questions.

[Abalkin] Many people today realize that it is necessary to make the switch to a market. But there are, of course, also people who associate the market with a bazaar, with muddle, with dancing prices. This is a fact, whether we like it or not. The people cling too tenaciously to stereotypes according to which market relations are the exclusive prerogative of capitalism. Well, the sown fruits have to be reaped....

Nevertheless, I am sure that everyone with a clear picture of the real situation in the economy and, in general, of economics as a science is well aware that we will not emerge from the crisis without a market.

I would just like to elaborate. The market is not the goal. The goal that the strategy of perestroyka sets itself together with such goals as equality, democracy, and social justice is the creation of a modern economy: highly efficient, flexible, receptive to scientific and technical progress, and geared to the consumer. And, taking into account the lessons of our historical past and world practice, it is perfectly clear today that the way to such an economy lies through the market. Without this, any attempts to firmly find our feet and acquire confidence in a worthy future are an empty and dangerous waste of time.

What, in short, is the essence of the government program? To our mind, a regulated market consists of three interconnected elements: a developed market mechanism with free price formation, free choice of partners, rivalry and competition between producers, a struggle for the consumer, and, in the end, competition for his ruble.

Second, there are economic regulators: tax, financial, and credit policies, price controls, a system of subsidies, etc. Nowhere in the world today is there a free, totally unregulated market. A free market, as proved once again by historical experience, is incapable of working efficiently.

And, finally, the third line, without which it would be politically impossible, in our view, to make the switch to a market, is a well thought-out system of social protection for citizens. For those who are by themselves powerless in the face of market changes and who need the state's special guardianship—pensioners, invalids, students, large families.... In addition, there is support for the able-bodied population, which must adapt itself to the market and be able to show its worth and reveal its abilities.

[Fedotov] Society's reaction to the government draft and the "confusion in minds" have also been reflected in a way in the discussion of the program for making the switch to a market at the USSR Supreme Soviet session. How do you assess the course of the debate?

[Abalkin] Ambivalently. The point is that we now have a real, tangible working program. Previously there were just words. We have been talking of making the switch to a market—first in a whisper, then in an undertone, and now straining our vocal cords—for 25 years, since 1965.

Finally, three years ago, the question of a radical economic reform with a subsequent switch to a market was directly raised at a party Central Committee plenum. Even then this was greeted, you might say, without emotion: Life had accustomed our people to treating vivid appeals—how can I put this somewhat more delicately?—philosophically: There are appeals and appeals, but life is life.

And when it turned out that this time words were being followed by concrete action, public opinion proved not entirely ready for this.

And, naturally, the parliamentary debate has proceeded on such a wave. What would I like to single out here? Well, first, the constructive, businesslike part of the discussion of the way to switch to a market. Many professional and convincing suggestions, amendments, and criticisms have been made, and these will undoubtedly be taken into account during the work on normative and planning documents. And much work lies ahead: In the fall it is necessary to prepare a package of documents, without which it would not make sense to approach a market, and to draw up the plan and budget for 1991 in a new and principled manner geared to the initial stage of the switch to a market. Here we are counting greatly on the real, interested participation of deputies who have serious, professional experience and knowledge of economics.

Another part of my feelings about the discussion of the government's concept: Unfortunately, we have not yet succeeded in finding the line that distinguishes between a rally and parliament; between simply emotions designed for public consumption, as it is customary to say, and a profound, responsible speech attesting not to a desire to "be noticed" on the rostrum but to a high level of competence.

It is precisely competence and professional knowledge of economics—I must state frankly—that many of our esteemed deputies greatly lack. It is very simple to proclaim to the whole enlightened world that a regulated market economy is impossible or to name "random" figures which supposedly overturn those cited in the program. But it is also necessary to think about the consequences. About the reaction to an empty retort

among people sitting by their television sets: both those who think professionally in economic terms and those—and this is the chief point!—who are trying to get to the truth, viewing the discussion as a school of universal basic economic education. Responsibility for information and choice of arguments—this is what I would like to wish for parliamentarians.

[Fedotov] Were alternative options for the switch to a market proposed during the discussion?

[Abalkin] No. Of course, what I have in mind is not slogans and appeals but a profoundly thought-out, comprehensive concept which would embrace all the "nerve centers" of the transfer to a market. If someone has such a version, let him not hide it in dark corners but submit it to the verdict of society.

I wish to emphasize in this connection that the government program was originally drawn up as an open document. It absorbed the recommendations of scientists and suggestions aired in the press, including by representatives of various public movements. The preliminary versions of the program were discussed with industrial workers, lessees, leaders of financial organs and banks, and scientists of various trends and scientific schools.

The government is even now ready for a dialogue, to discuss conceptual ideas and specific proposals and to take them into account in the documents that are being prepared. I hope that this will make it possible to avoid a confrontation. However, there is no love without reciprocity. The existence of forces with an interest in worsening the economic situation still remains a reality, since any improvement and, correspondingly, an increase in confidence in the government would spell the collapse of these forces' political ambitions. But no one can be permitted to toy with the destinies of millions. All this has happened before....

[Fedotov] People's widespread reading of the market mechanism links the switch to a market chiefly with a price hike. What would you say to this?

[Abalkin] The program submitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet is a document worked out in detail which includes all the most important aspects of the economy's perestroyka on the basis of market principles—transformations in ownership relations, destatization of the economy, forms of encouraging labor activeness, a market for means of production or wholesale trade, a consumer market, a financial market, etc.

As regards prices, they are prescribed very specifically, with figures. And this has its own logic and its own justification. The report at the Second Congress of People's Deputies stated on behalf of the government: No decisions will be adopted in this sphere without broad nationwide discussion. We promised this and had to do this. But, before discussing something, it is necessary to propose something.

In our proposals we took the path of the complete truth—we decided to tell the people without embellishment or craftiness what it is planned to increase and by how much and how the compensation mechanism will operate in this case. And I believe this is perfectly correct: It is both immoral and simply impermissible to urge people to discuss and to express their will without revealing the complete truth to them.

From what premise did we proceed in our pricing policy? From the premise that our present price formation is a "realm of distorting mirrors" where it is possible to see everything but the truth. A very complex, very tangled legacy of decades of self-deception. Then there are the R100 billion subsidies paid out of the budget, and in a very irrational manner, because they go not to those who work well (in agriculture, let us say) but to those who work any old how. A market is incompatible with such an economy.

Moreover, one wonders, what is a subsidy? Many people think that it is a good deed, a kind of state charity. In fact it is underpaid wages or underpaid pensions, which are given back in an inconceivably "distorted" manner through low prices. In addition, subsidies are distributed very unevenly on the regional and social planes and go first to those who have access to goods on sale at low prices. What social justice is there here?

Therefore a more natural option is to remove this sum total of subsidies, increase prices, and give back the money to those who have earned or merited it.

The proposed system is not yet a market system in itself. The market will require flexible prices which will be geared to demand and take account of product quality and the volumes of goods and services offered. This clears the way for the market. In short, we have determined that a preparatory stage is needed. At this stage it is necessary to adopt new legislative acts and create a market infrastructure (enterprises with various forms of ownership, commodity exchanges, commercial information centers) and, finally, it is necessary to free the budget from excessive loads and rid the pricing system of its long-standing, pointless deformation.

This will make it possible to go over to a market from a normal starting base, not from ruins. Therefore I would like to repeat that the planned price hike is not connected with the market itself. All this is preparatory work and, if you like, thankless donkeywork connected with creating the conditions for making the transfer to a market. And it is impossible to dispense with this difficult step.

I also wish to emphasize that a transfer awaits us which will require tremendous efforts, the removal of stereotypes and habits, and a different attitude toward labor, commercial activity, and initiative. It is a transfer attended by considerable costs and, to be honest, substantial losses. It is a very difficult question with which the government has been struggling for several months.

How are we to minimize these losses and distribute them in favor of the weak and defenseless? In order to compensate precisely these sections of the population down to a percentage or half a percentage point for the possible drop in living standards. We have, I believe, managed to arrive at this.

People are now saying: But it is possible to organize the market without any losses at all. It is not possible! This is verging on a miracle, a "magic wand" which will change everything at the very first wish. As a human being, I am prepared to understand faith in a quick and easy way. As a specialist and a member of the government, I have no right to indulge in pipedreams or "gloss over difficulties." Simple prescriptions just do not exist. The most dangerous thing is to create illusions: They destroy faith. And we are short on faith as it is....

[Fedotov] There are two viewpoints about the present government, which are very likely well known to you. First, that it is lagging behind the times and is too sluggish. The second is the direct opposite: It is jumping the gun and changes its decisions like gloves. Could you comment on this?

[Abalkin] I must say that the government is not sinless. We probably deserve to be rebuked for inadequate firmness in pursuing our line and, perhaps, for a certain inconsistency. But it is simply unfair, in my opinion, to accuse us of being inflexible and responding badly to the changing social situation. The program elaborated and supported by the Second Congress of People's Deputies is a six-year strategic program. We proceeded from the premise that it is necessary first to "treat" the economy, bring down the "high temperature" in the consumer market, balance material and financial resources, and on this thoroughly prepared ground begin the switch to a market. Then the switch would be less painful.

We were counting on such a development of events, bearing in mind that it would be possible to improve matters prior to a market, without market mechanisms. But the past six months, when the situation was changing before our very eyes, as it were, led us to the conviction that such a sequence of events would not produce the expected results. Matters cannot be rectified in the economy without introducing elements of a market.

The need arose to advance the time of the transfer to market relations, to shift it to 1990-1991, and to take measures in parallel to improve the economy's health. With this option the process of developing the market will be more painful and harder. But the realities have to be taken into account. And this, in the final analysis, is what flexibility means.

[Fedotov] In what direction will work on the switch to market relations develop now? There are probably nuances and details in the government concept under discussion which require an explanation, are there not?

[Abalkin] A document such as the government program is of significance for formulating decisions: Will we take the proposed course or will we delay a while? It does not have any real influence on the economy. The chief thing to be done now is to complete the preparation of the package of documents ensuring the legal basis for the market's operation. It is proposed that this package will have been prepared by the fall and submitted to the next Supreme Soviet session. They are laws on the single all-Union market, on banking activity, on joint-stock companies, on employment, and on indexing the population's income, an antimonopoly law, and certain others.

Then the Supreme Soviet has to decide the question of holding a nationwide discussion of the proposed draft: How, precisely, is civic expression of will to be defined, and which questions must be formulated for this? As far as I know, we have not had such experience in the recent past. We will have to think responsibly and profoundly.

[Fedotov] Trade in Moscow is now on the basis of the presentation of passports, and I suspect that things are no better in other cities. All this clearly does not strengthen faith in imminent abundance. What can be done to stabilize the situation and to calm public opinion not within years but within months?

[Abalkin] Allow me to begin from afar. No one—no country, no government—has announced a price reform as far in advance as we have done. At best, people have learned of this a few days before the action. Any specialist will tell you that if you announce a rise far in advance, such a reaction as the one now is simply inevitable.

Why then did the government act contrary to generally accepted practice and provoke speculative demand while being "of sound mind and body"? We were disposed toward this decision because of the sociopolitical situation: discontent, indignation, and a crisis of confidence of a general nature (people trust neither the party Central Committee, nor the government, nor the court and prosecutor's office organs, nor deputies, nor even the press).

In this situation the only chance of preventing a social explosion was to honestly declare our intentions and reveal the mechanism of the price reform, the terms for compensation.... And this had to be done in good time.

Of course, we were aware of the unpopularity of this measure among people and we could guess the reaction. On the other hand, I do not think anyone will be able to accuse us of "cooking up" the reform on the quiet, in secret, and behind the people's backs and presenting people with a fait accompli.

Now about what must be done to reduce the hullabaloo. Here you must be a realist, not a romantic. For there is a persistent stereotype now: The party and the government are blamed for everything.

But quite a lot of time has elapsed since the resolution of social questions and of the organization of trade, public

catering, and housing construction was transferred entirely to the republics and local soviets. The government does not resolve these questions, except for the general distribution of certain funds among the republics plus imported purchases.

So it is the concern of local soviet organs to organize trade correctly and to implement protective measures.

[Fedotov] Then this question arises: Will it not turn out that oblasts and regions will disperse to their own "ancillary food stores"? For, now that "passport sales" have been legalized, those who supply Moscow with food might reasonably declare a boycott of it: We do not have enough ourselves, but here is a sponger, and one with ambitions moreover.

[Abalkin] Such a thing is perfectly possible and is even happening already.

[Fedotov] How is social justice to be maintained here?

[Abalkin] A question of agreements and contracts. Of course, since Moscow has introduced restrictions on sales of foodstuffs, it cannot obtain the previous stocks. This is unjust. It would be more correct to share here.

And yet, these are temporary measures. The chief idea is to stabilize and fill the market by implementing everything conceived in the program. It is very important to understand that without these difficult and unpopular measures and without a balance between supply and demand speculation will not diminish, backdoor sales will not be avoided, and the flowering of crime will not be halted. The ruble's prestige will fall and fall, and with its fall the incentive for productive labor will also diminish....

In short, it is becoming increasingly clear that the country has no way other than that of market relations. It will be unable to restore its lofty prestige in the eyes of its own citizens and in the eyes of the world community and to ensure a worthy life for the present and future generations without switching to a market economy. This is inevitable if we want to become a really flourishing and self-respecting country.

[Fedotov] Suppose the people accept the government program. How soon will they feel changes for the better? How will this be expressed?

[Abalkin] It is very important not to waver but to implement the program decisively and consistently, without yielding to chance or pressure and without wasting the effect that can be obtained during the first stages of market relations.

The point is that even the first actions connected with stabilizing the market must produce one substantial result—they must really fill the market with goods. Yes, at high prices! But the most important thing for us today is to remove this problem. Why must speculators call the shots and the Soviet mafia grow fat because of shortages?...

No, the actual volume of consumption will not increase overnight, and living standards will not increase as of January 1991 and might even fall. It will take time to secure a real return. But the very fact of the creation of a balanced market and the availability of goods is a tremendous moral incentive for confidence in the future.

As regards tangible, noticeable progress in raising living standards, the market mechanism has to be tuned and set in motion. This will take approximately two years.

[Fedotov] Take such a seemingly particular fact. The chief of a mobile mechanized column located, you might say, under the capital's wing—at Kholshcheviki in Moscow Oblast—has spent six months traipsing around offices. In the end, he "fetched up" at the State Board of Arbitration. What is he concerned about? His superior construction association will not set him free, that is to say, let him have a lease. And this despite the fact that the Law on Leasing was adopted exactly six months ago.

Hence this question: Will it not turn out that the package of laws aimed at going over to a market will share the fate of the previous, alas nonworking documents and will get stuck in the moloch of the apparatus?

[Abalkin] If it were possible to change actual economic conditions and human psychology with the help of decrees alone, we would long ago have restructured our entire life.

We should not entertain illusions! We should not think: We will promulgate a law, and bureaucrats, loafers, and talentless people will stand at attention in order then to vie with one another to carry out the law. This does not happen. A natural environment is needed.

No law will operate properly without a market, without freedom to choose partners, without changing the whole system of material and technical supply, etc. Without this the system will reject the law: It is alien to the system. Therefore it is difficult today to break through to the new without a struggle, without persistence, without the ability to defend one's position, right to court. It is difficult at present....

[Fedotov] The final question: What at this moment is of greatest concern to you as a man and as a deputy premier who had a hand in the government program?

[Abalkin] The lack of concord in our society, the split between opposing forces, the lack of responsibility for the country's fate. You can argue as much as you like and engage in polemics, but it is essential to know how to listen and, most importantly, to reach agreement. Unless you reach agreement, you cannot start acting and make progress.

Can the CPSU become a force to unite our society? The congress will reply to this. And there could be varying replies: Its prestige has fallen quite badly, and confidence in it as well. It would be a mistake to labor under a delusion on this score. But I believe that there is still an opportunity to become this healthy force and to rise

above all the present disagreements, since the people's interests are the most important thing. This ability needs to be demonstrated.

Is the party taking this opportunity? I would like, I would very much like it to do so....

Economist on Transition to Market Economy

PM1105211090 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 May 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Interview with economist and journalist O. Latsis, by correspondent R. Lynev; place and date not stated: "Facing the Market"]

[Text] [Lynev] And so the government program to switch the economy to a market relations footing has been published. And the very first days of its discussion in the USSR Supreme Soviet have shown that the deputies' attitude toward it varies. Sociologists' studies also confirm the great diversity of public opinion regarding the switch to the market. And what is your attitude toward the program, when your position as a scientist and journalist has been known for so many years: only the market. Are you satisfied? Or not entirely?

[Latsis] First of all it is a good thing that we have finally understood that all our attempts to "rectify" administrative-edict routine will lead to nothing. We have understood that we had nothing left apart from this step—toward the market. Although not each of us can explain why, for instance, only a year ago we hoped somehow to avoid the market, now the majority is prepared to accept it. What is this about? I think that it is the degree to which our situation has deteriorated over the past year. Deteriorated so far that no hope remained of somehow bypassing the market. Just think: Of 1,100 commodity groups today, only five percent are not in short supply. That is shortage has become general. Trade has ceased to exist. And people feel this not only in the abstract, statistically, but specifically, when they go to the store. Previously automobiles, sheepskin coats, and furs were in short supply, now soap, light bulbs, and school exercise books are also. Groats, flour, and pasta have been bought up in connection with the rumors of price increases. Only salt still stands firm.

[Lynev] That is, in a certain preponderance of public opinion in favor of the market it is possible to see a kind of desperation effect following the logic that things cannot get worse, after all, so let it happen.

[Latsis] I do not know how correct the figures are from the polls confirming the preponderance of opinion in favor of the market. Alongside the readiness to accept the market as a kind of inevitability there is the opinion that the switch to the market is connected with an increase in prices. And that prospect cannot fail to alarm people.

[Lynev] But surely the government program is aimed at if not eliminating at least allaying these alarms?

[Latsis] It is here that we must explain to people how the market differs from the "nonmarket." Primarily by the fact that the price for a commodity is set not by the producer and not by the State Committee for Prices but by the consumer, the market itself. Hence the task of liberating prices.

[Lynev] Yet under our conditions liberating does mean increasing.

[Latsis] Liberated prices can rise or fall depending on the specific situation. In our situation when there is far more money than there are commodities, we must tell the truth: Prices will initially increase considerably. And the government, understanding, on the one hand, the inevitability of this increase and, on the other, anxious not to subject the people to shock therapy, is proposing that it should increase prices itself and at the same time compensate the people for the consequences of this increase.

[Lynev] Here I remember the picture of the soccer referee, already familiar from our economic journalism, who would like if not to score goals himself then at least predetermine the outcome of the game.

[Latsis] I prize all the more the fact that the program for the transition to the market system proposed by the government will have to pass an examination before the people. That is very important both for the people and for the government so that it can receive a vote of confidence. This is necessary not only so that a decision is taken but also so that the decision should be fulfilled. So that the people should not feel in the next few years that a program of action has been imposed from above but that it has been consciously adopted.

But in this connection I would suggest to deputies and all participants in the discussion that they think about the following point. Yes, the government is concerned at the social consequences of the rise in prices. But would these consequences not be easier if the process were extended, as is proposed, over several years? Should we also exclude in advance, immediately, as unsuitable, another option: A race between incomes and prices proceeds for several month according to certain established rules—they increase. In Poland this process took six months and in Yugoslavia a year but after that at some level prices stop and even begin to decline somewhat. Here the Yugoslavs have calculated that prices have come to such a firm standstill, that the dinar has come to such a stable standstill, that it is possible to allow not only market price formation but also to make the dinar convertible and to introduce the free sale of dollars for dinars. And this has happened remarkably easily in their country. As a result government stocks of several billion dollars laid in to reassure any panic have even increased.

If we return to us at home, we have emphasized the adverse consequences of shock therapy: the rise of prices, unemployment, and inflation. But here we forget something else: Yes, prices grow, but the market is filled with goods before our very eyes. You can talk about what kind of compensation there should be with this option and

what protective reaction against unemployment there should be. But if commodities are there life ceases to be a constant struggle for survival as it is in our country today. There is an enormous social advance: Once there are commodities that means the speculator disappears. That means privilege as such disappears.

[Lynev] Well, why is a gradual transition in that sense bad? Because the tail is not cut off at once but in several goes, as we say?

[Latsis] Because we shall probably get the increase in prices and the connected adverse consequences even with our gradual option, but we will not acquire a stabilized market filled with goods and I am not sure that in the social sense it is preferable. That is why I would suggest thinking about the referendum formula.

[Lynev] That is instead of today's two options—gradual transition to the market and the renunciation of the market in general—you would offer either an accelerated or a gradual transition.

[Latsis] Two years ago the Polish Government—a communist government at the time, I should remind you—in general put the question like that. The majority of those polled were in favor of acceleration. But the government, not considering this majority to be sufficiently stable, proposed the gradual transition as being nonetheless more correct. And what happened? It was soon faced with the need for radicalization but the time allocated to it had passed. As a result the reform, a radical one this time, was carried out by a different government, a different political force.

[Lynev] Do you believe that is possible in our country?

[Latsis] We have no complete analogy with Poland on the political or psychological plane or in our traditions. And I assess our economic potential more optimistically. I am sure that we will succeed in overcoming a great deal more easily, but that is a separate issue. At present we are talking about something else: About how no option other than the gradual one is even being examined in our country. Who has decided for us, and why, that the "shock therapy" option planned for 6 to 12 months is a bad thing while the gradual option extending over several years will spare us from a shock? And in general I would not speak of a shock but of the slow or rapid options.

[Lynev] And the third option? Surely it is not ruled out?

[Latsis] You mean leaving everything as it is? But here in my opinion there is nothing to discuss. That choice would be a tragedy for us all.

[Lynev] But what then?

[Latsis] Then people would have to be helped to rid themselves of illusions regarding the rationing system and we would have to explain that a bureaucrat would decide for them when they could have shoes and of what size. Here whereas, for instance, during the war 15 basic goods were distributed and there were disruptions even then—your fat coupons would be traded in for combined fat—now the power of the bureaucrat and of the trade worker now extends to the entire multiplicity of modern goods. As we can see in the bargain sales of all kinds.

[Lynev] Consequently, in ridding people of illusions we must explain to them directly that ration cards are a path that does not lead to greater justice but goes in the directly opposite direction: to a far greater dependence than today on all kinds of "masters of life" who influence the distribution of goods. But in the concept of the transition to the market there is one more big problem—inflation. You can hardly resolve it in six months.

[Latsis] I believe that the government draft makes scant mention of this. But it should be said frankly that inflation—when there is more money than goods, which is expressed in a rise in the cost of living—exists and will exist in our country. With any option.

The rise in the cost of living? It is obvious today in cooperative trade and on the kolkhoz [collective farm] market. It is somewhat more restrained in state trade where, counter to logic, we are order prices to remain low. But what is the point if they do not rise on the price lists? Inflation is manifested in other ways: The lines grow, as do payments to salesmen and speculators and goods disappear. What use is it to me if a piece of bath soap costs 10 kopeks if I have forgotten what it looks like? In Moscow each person can only be sold five pieces of soap at a ruble a time. That means the price of soap has in fact increased tenfold.

[Lynev] That means that inflation in our country is concealed. Under the market it becomes open.

[Latsis] Yes, today we are curbing inflation like steam under the lid of a kettle. But we ourselves are cooking in this kettle.

Of course, open inflation is no blessing either. But with open inflation at least there are goods. But here, just try to buy something. It is difficult to control inflation. What is the government to do under these conditions? A number of states by its representatives say that the excess mass of money is the result of excessive individual incomes. Well, that is an important factor of inflation. But calculations show that it nonetheless plays a secondary role compared to the irrational structure of the government's expenditure leading to an enormous state budget deficit. One of our main troubles is that we can produce many of the goods we need because we produce too many goods we do not need and we immobilize funds in land reclamation and in long-term construction sites, erecting two plants where we could have made do with one. The construction workers are paid for both plants, they go to the store, but the plant they have not finished constructing has produced no goods. That is the main source of inflation. And complaints about this should be leveled today not only against the government but also against the Supreme Soviet, which in my opinion behaves more extravagantly with regard to the

state budget than all preceding bureaucrats. Many deputies, in criticizing the government, speak of reducing the budget deficit and at the same time demand an increase in expenditure in the interests of the social groups they represent. Generous expenditure is planned, but what about revenue? Where is it to come from? Increasingly from the mint.

The government proceeds from the correct idea accepted by economists throughout the world that a deficit should not be more than two to three percent of the GNP. For us that means R20-25 billion. But that has never once been the case in our country in the current five-year plan, the figure was R48 billion in 1986, R88 billion the year before last, and R92 billion last year. Our "brilliant" vodka operation, the decline of world prices for oil, and Chernobyl had an effect here. This year it is planned to reduce the deficit to R60 billion but it will most likely remain at the level of R80-90 billion. So far no curbing of money in our country has been successful. And I fear that it will not be with our present approaches.

[Lynev] What is to be done?

[Latsis] It is here, on the budget, that we should focus attention and prescribe in detail where we will save so that there is no deficit: primarily on state investments, on defense, and on management. The program pays no serious attention to things such as the use of resources. Yet in our country commodity stocks worth R500 billion have accumulated and of these R200 billion are above-norm. We have several five-year plan increases lying around like this. Where is the action aimed at insuring this is put into circulation? It cannot be done by administrative means. Matters must be arranged as they were in the early twenties, when enterprises sold everything in order to make up their extreme shortage of working capital. There was the slogan "a living kopek is better than a dead ruble." They sold at any price as long as they could get working capital. This was stimulated by tough credit terms. Today everyone in our country receives credit at two percent interest, including for above-norm stocks: both profitable enterprises and unprofitable ones, which will never return the credit. No bank in the world gives credit on those terms.

[Lynev] But you have in mind a bank independent of the government.

[Latsis] The decision to make the State Bank independent should have been taken yesterday, and would take the Supreme Soviet five minutes. Lenin could not demand that the chairman of the board of the State Bank print money, but Ryzhkov can.

If we seriously want to switch to the market economy next year and begin to increase prices then as of 1 July this year and subsequently we must have a budget of extreme thrift. But in the program this task is also somewhere in the shadows. To all appearances they have no serious intention of controlling the flow of money. That cannot fail to alarm us. And that means, apart from anything else, that the detailed accounts offered in the program as to what should be increased, when, and by how much, are pointless. This smells of the old approaches toward compiling five-year plans. The introduction of a market economy does not require such detailing. Its rules provide not for the final percentage but for conditions in which activity will proceed: the opportunity to maneuver, the options for using reserves....

Nonetheless among the ideas proposed by the government I would support that of increasing the price of bread. Here this should be done before any referendums—on 1 July. Although it would have been better to do it 20 years ago.

[Lynev] Why do you single out precisely this government proposal?

[Latsis] The bread market in our country is saturated and bread consumption is not regulated by price. For us bread is not a commodity in short supply, we buy as much as we want. But here is what I want to dwell on. With an increase in the price of bread we are promised full compensation. People are dubious: What then is the point? There is a lot of point. Here it is worth discussing the actual concept of full compensation. It is very often used without explanation. So those who use it, including official representatives, voluntarily or involuntarily mislead people. What kind of compensation does the head of government have in mind? It will be full compensation for the budget and for the state as a whole. That is the budget revenue will increase by the same amount that prices rise. But this is heard not simply by the country but by specific people. And everyone thinks that full compensation means that the same amount as has been taken will be returned. But that is not quite the case. It is impossible to return exactly the same amount to each person individually but the average sum can be calculated. Hypothetically speaking if each person spends 10 kopeks a day on bread—R3 a month—then when the price is trebled he will spend R9nine and receive a wage increase of R6. He would seem to be in the same position as before. But we may remain in the same position as before while our neighbor throws out bread as soon as it is hard. So that in fact he spends R5 a month—after all, bread is cheap (but now it will be expensive, which means the neighbor will not throw it out). And he will receive compensation not for his entire expenditure but only for part of it. And someone else feeds his piglets with bread and buys it not for R3 but R30 a month and it would be strange for him not to do this if the state had created a price for him which makes this profitable. But he will also receive an extra R6 a month in wages. As a result the operation of feeding pigs with bread will become unprofitable. According to calculations the reduction in grain expenditure in the country will be five million tonnes—after all this is part of the 30-40 million tonnes a year which we annually buy for dollars. That runs into billions of dollars.

[Lynev] I have understood: The example of bread is a simple one. But even here there are complications.

[Latsis] That is the point. Compensation is even more complex when it is a case of meat, where the difference will be even more striking. It is well known that in Moscow, thanks to state prices and supplies, there are over 100 kg of meat per capita, without counting visitors, it is true. But in the provinces there are places where there is simply no meat in state trade. There a person consumes 10-20 kg, while the average for the country is 57 kg. Behind this average indicator stand those who do not buy even a gram of R2-meat and those who eat 120 kg a year. That means that a subsidy—the concept cites figures for this—despite prevalent opinion will not smooth over social injustice but aggravate it. What else would I put to the government's credit? That is has finally said frankly that the present prices structure and the present approach toward prices when they are kept by administrative means at a level lower than the balance of supply and demand is not a blessing for the low-paid. When a price is lower than the balance price a food will unfailingly be in short supply. Here a kind of system of normative distribution is immediately introduced and while in the settlement or city or at the enterprise distribution is by coupon and through buffets, who buys more of this meat at two rubles—the worker, the director, or the pensioner who does not work at the plant and does not receive coupons? It is clear that he who has the higher social status and higher wages has a greater opportunity to buy food cheaply. These figures have been in the hands of the State Committee for Statistics for a long time but they have never been published. Now they have been cited: The lower your wages, the more you pay for meat, the higher your wages, then on average the less you pay. It is clear that when we change this system then for the lower paid, who have bought little subsidized meat, this will be overcompensation, that is they will receive compensation not for the 20-30 kg they consume but for some average consumption norm. Personally I am in favor of compensation not being on a percentage basis—which is what the government suggests—but being equal for all. Thus, if the level by which food prices rise is an average of R45 per person, then every person should be given an increase of R45 to his wages, pension, or grant. If you calculate in percentages, then those who used to receive R100 will have an extra R20 while those who received R500 will have an extra R100. In other words, a percentage-based supplement is unjustified both economically and socially.

[Lynev] Here we have approached the concept of indexing, a new one for us. The cost of the shopping basket has increased so there should be relevant compensation in incomes, particularly for low-paid categories.

[Latsis] Here I would raise the question of the periodicity of introducing indexing. The program suggests once a quarter, and that is tolerable, if the growth of indexes in our country is the same throughout the quarter. But what if there are spirals in our country as there have been in Yugoslavia, where the annual index was 1,000 percent? Is it possible to catch up with indexing once a quarter? No. The population will suffer.

[Lynev] Yet some reforms seem to be concerned only that some people should in fact lose some of their savings. As you know, there is even a proposal for a money reform which would allegedly hit above all unearned accumulations.

[Latsis] I am sure that unearned capital cannot be taken away in this manner. We must put the question differently: What can?

In our country there is only something in the order of R350 billion in savings banks and a further R200 billion in "hot rubles." And annual commodity turnover is about R400 billion. That is the correlation between commodity turnover and savings is approximately one to one. In the world it is the other way around: one to two or one to five. The average European has far more savings than we do. And now the irrational task of confiscating this money is being set. But the task, on the contrary, is to ensure that money stays in the savings banks. It is dangerous at the moment of transition if it is dealt with ineptly. That is why more attention should be paid to this money. In what sense do savings present a problem? In the sense that people want to buy something with them but there are no commodities. But if people know that a price rise is looming then even a small increase of 10 percent means a loss of part of their investment, and what if it is a 100 percent rise? And a doubling or trebling of food prices! Apart from being unfair this is also dangerous. As soon as people realize that, all these billions will disappear from the savings banks and inflation pressure will increase sharply. So is it not better on the contrary to act as in Yugoslavia where, if prices have increased 20 percent, the investment also increases 20 percent. In addition to the bank's own interest rate which is not two percent, as in our country, but more. A two percent interest rate does not exist anywhere in the world. That is, in addition to the usual payment of interest, there is a supplementary payment for money investments with a consideration for indexing. But there is not even any talk of this in our country. That is, there is talk, but it is in a highly abstract form. A system of special measures is allegedly being elaborated. But this must be announced before the referendum in a package of measures.

[Lynev] Finally, there is another range of questions connected with the transition to the market—to do with employment. Or, if you like, unemployment.

[Latsis] A monstrous figure is cited in this connection: 40 million unemployed in the long term. I do not know how that can be calculated. I think this is in general a figure "plucked out of thin air" to intimidate the people. That is why I consider to be absolutely correct the remark made by L. Abalkin, who said that we should not speak of unemployment at all but of the release of manpower. Yes, the market will change the structure of our production in a toughly enforced but at the same time progressive way. It will close down an enormous number of unnecessary production facilities. It is the market which can do what the plan could not do: alter the situation

whereby we produce twice as much ferrous metal as the United States but, however, produce less final machine building output.

Of course, the release of people, their dismissal, the reduction of personnel—all this will happen. Although they should we ascribe this sin only to capitalism? Surely enterprises close down under socialism? Indeed in some conditions closure is inevitable: A mine has been completely worked, a timber procurement establishment has cut down an entire forest. We have always had enterprises closing down.

[Lynev] I shall add that in the past two years over 200 chemical enterprises and production facilities have been closed down for ecological reasons.

[Latsis] Abalkin cites the following figure: With the start of economic accountability a million people a year are being released in our country. And that will continue. But as a rule it is not enterprises but production facilities which will close down. With the transition to the market this may be accelerated, yet at the same time there is a tremendous shortage of manpower in our country. In addition, the services sphere is utterly undeveloped in our country and that is one more reason why we live badly. Capacities are used appallingly in our country—second shifts do not operate. Because there are no people. And the enormous potential of the cooperative movement?

I think in general that of the two adverse social consequences which will be generated by the transition to the market—the rise in prices and people's dismissal from production facilities—the rise in prices is not the more serious. It is easier to overcome on condition there is compensation. It is the likelihood of unemployment which is more serious. The main attention should be focused here. And L. Abalkin is absolutely right when he says that we must build a system of measures in the most attentive manner and create a state program for preventing unemployment, a program for finding jobs, retraining people, and redeploying them. And only if it is totally impossible to help a man should we deem him to be unemployed but we should not regard unemployment benefit as the main means of overcoming the social consequences.

[Lynev] This talk was headlined "Facing the Market." I am not the only one to have had the idea of giving this name to a new IZVESTIYA rubric under which it is planned to discuss the government program and problems of the country's transition to a new, market economy. We shall consider that the foundation has been laid.

Role of Management Training in Reforms Cited

PM0706143090 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Article by M. Krushinskiy under the rubric: "Facing the Market": "Cadres for Reform"]

[Text] Getting ready as we are for a long-distance swimming race through the waves of the market economy, the majority of us cannot swim. Of course, a situation involving the need to catch up on something urgently is not new for us in principle—long ago Czar Peter the Great ran into something similar when he was undertaking reforms. All the same, it was easier for him. In that age, the backwardness in relation to foreign countries was confined mainly to the technological sphere, and it was necessary primarily to acquire engineering know-how. Today, this is not enough, because what is at issue is the replacement of a whole economic way of life.

We ourselves have a rather hazy conception of the depth of our own incompetence in market problems, insofar as we do not even have an instrument to measure it. In the United States, for instance, an extensive system operates—thousands of special centers where people aspiring to leading economic posts are subjected to a painstakingly thorough professional examination. It is said that in the course of this, everything is taken into consideration—even a factor as insignificant for us as whether the conjunction of the stars is favorable or not particularly favorable for a given candidacy.

It might be objected that even if we are not very strong in astrology, we were not born yesterday: We coped with industrialization, we will cope with competition, too. And that when the need arises, we will find our way, and after all, no one ever learned to swim without swimming.

True enough. But some people would not have had to spend months (if not years) blowing bubbles and watching those who made a more successful start receding into the distance. Those who did not begrudge the time and money for preliminary training or, to put it more simply, for learning (albeit initially only theoretically) the methods of work under market conditions. The main point is that the market itself can function and feed us all only on the condition that at least the majority of us master its laws.

Fortunately, the ideas of accelerated preparation for the changes are increasingly gaining a hold on the masses. I personally came away with this conviction from the "Bor" leisure center, where I attended a four-day seminar of representatives of schools of business and management. Just think of it—what words are these! Only recently they were almost swear words, and now, it seems, they are entering our vocabulary as Peter's "colleges," academies," and "tables of ranks" once did.

So then, the seminar. Several dozen people from many areas of the country, mainly aged "around 30": leaders of teaching centers, enterprises, and production sections, and cooperative members. Lectures by the venerable economists A. Aganbegyan, P. Bunich, and A. Orlov. Discussions and roundtables, mainly about how to train in the shortest possible time the most managers with a mastery of the science that goes by the name of "marketing," able to use computer technology, understanding the basics in advertising, knowing how to win the trust of

their own collective and their business partners at home and abroad.... Finally, the "Manager-1990" competition, or to be more precise, the second round of this competition, the winner of which will be "tempted" with a training term with a Western firm.

I would like to give the people and organizations concerned in all this their due. For instance, the Moscow Oblast Science and Production Association, the USSR Managers' Union, the USSR Council of Ministers Academy of the National Economy, the USSR Union of Lessees and Entrepreneurs, commercial banks from Moscow and the Moscow region, and the editorial boards of the newspapers LENINSKOYE ZNAMYA and MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS. I would like also to share a few ideas I "overheard" at the seminar, or which cropped up in the course of discussions.

The most burning question, perhaps, is about the source of the know-how we lack. Where indeed are we to obtain it? A school of our own has yet to be created and the literature is lacking. There are, of course, even in our country, wise theorists and bravura practitioners whose experience (not always legal) in the use of market mechanisms might now come in useful. But all the same, we will not get by without a foreign "injection," and this presents, perhaps, a problem of some delicacy.

I cannot say what currency reserves were available to the reforming sovereign when he sent adolescent noblemen for training abroad, but we for our part are not exactly rolling in them (I mean reserves, of course). For us it is easier, perhaps, only in that, unlike in Peter's times, we do not have to send anyone abroad by force—we can make do perfectly well with volunteers. There is probably even a surplus of people willing to go: At the seminar the figure was put at 1 million people! Such a major excess of demand for trips abroad over supply (or rather, over our financial potential) generates, like any shortage, the distortions characteristic of the distributive economy: string-pulling and privileges, and this, let me add, is not only bad in itself, but also diminishes the efficiency of the system, because it is not always the most able who set off on the quest for knowledge. What is the solution?

In my opinion the USSR Managers' Union is successfully groping toward it. Under its auspices the so-called "Reform Cadres" foundation has been set up, whose task consists precisely in the selection of promising candidates (age—not over 27!) for training abroad. They undergo not only a rigorous professional selection process, but also preliminary training in a foreign language and computer skills.

The foundation has resources, including currency, at its disposal. Where from? From far-sighted enterprises and organizations interested in training their own management cadres. But what about a capable youth who does not have the backing of a rich sponsor? Is he consequently cut off forever from "currency" know-how? Not at all, S. Konchakovskiy, deputy director of the foundation, explains. Foreign firms operating on USSR territory, who of course also need managers with high qualifications, are joining in: To hire a Soviet citizen—even with his initial training—works out cheaper than "assigning" someone from abroad.

In general, cadres, including management cadres, are a profitable sphere of capital investment, although the returns may not come in very quickly. A. Ushakov, chief specialist at the management personnel problems department of the USSR Council of Ministers State Commission for Economic Reform, entirely agrees with this. He points in particular to the example of China, which gave foreign training to many thousands of its specialists, not shrinking from the expenditure of state gold reserves on these goals. How to ensure the maximum effectiveness of this expenditure is a different question.

Because the Chinese, my collocutor says, have found that their young managers returning from abroad with their reforming ideas frequently are unable to "fit into" their home environment. People have trouble understanding them, because they speak an "economic language" alien to those around them. Some signs of this irritating phenomenon are already being observed here too. Consequently, there should be a mixed approach. We should not rely entirely on foreign countries: They will, of course, teach us about the market, but they can hardly teach us about the transitional period. And even if we had entirely unrestricted currency potential, we would never get away from the need to create our own multifaceted, extensive system of specialist training.

In N.I. Ryzhkov's report to the USSR Supreme Soviet session only one small paragraph, the third from the end, is devoted to this problem. But to conclude that the government underestimates it would hardly be just. It is clear today that without powerful cadre training, our assaults on the command economy are doomed to failure. Are the state's resources, extremely modest as we know them to be, sufficient for this?

Less is required than one might think. The beauty of the market mechanism is that, given even a minimal degree of freedom, it is capable of looking after itself subsequently. And that includes providing itself with qualified specialists.

It was stated at the seminar that in Moscow alone roughly 30 management training centers and schools are already operating. These are of the most diverse kinds—from solid enterprises with international reputations like the center set up two years ago under the Plekhanov Institute of the National Economy (with its own scientific base and full-time and part-time courses, including courses leading to the issue of a higher education diploma) to small cooperative institutions designed for one-week or two-week courses of lectures and business games. And how many of these schools and centers are there in the country as a whole? No one knows precisely;

presumably hundreds. And their number is growing. Why? Well, because there is demand from people who are able to pay!

In other words, a market for economic know-how and business skills has been born and is taking shape in the country, which allows the "reform and management cadres" issue itself to be discussed in market terms. We can speak about producers and consumers, the quality and suitability in practice of a given "commodity," prices, the competition battle. Stretching the point a little, we can even speak about importation—know-how arriving in various ways from abroad.

Of course it is still rather early to leap into euphoria. The market is still a long way from saturation point, hence monopolistically high prices predominate, while quality by no means always meets public requirements. There is an acute shortage of economic autonomy and of responsibility on the part of all the trading partners: After all, the "customers" (the directors of enterprises) frequently pay not from their own pockets, but from the state's, so that the question of the deal's efficiency is secondary for them. Much here still needs tightening up and adjusting. But it is to be expected that as the overall improvement of finances and ownership relations proceeds, so this sector of the future market economy, its hope and support, will also gain strength.

Finance Minister Pavlov on 'Emergency' Steps

PM0806104490 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Interview with Doctor of Economic Sciences V.S. Pavlov, USSR minister of finance, by V. Romanyuk under the rubric "Facing the Market"; place, date not given: "The State Budget in an Emergency"]

[Text] [Romanyuk] Valentin Sergeyevich, the public are really agitated about the current discussion of the government's proposed outline for the transition to a regulated market economy. There has been talk of emergency measures and even an emergency budget. Can we really expect an operation to revise the state budget that was approved for 1990?

[Pavlov] What a suggestion! The state budget was approved by the USSR Supreme Soviet last fall and is not subject to revision. It is another matter that emergency measures must be adopted to save state epxenditure, a proportion of which is budget expenditure. Emergency measures are also needed to increase the income of the state (and of the state budget). And these should be not so much measures of an economic nature as organizational, political measures.

[Romanyuk] So where do we start? With income?

[Pavlov] But that is the weakest link in the course of implementation of the country's budget. Unfortunately, the national economy is seeing a fall in physical volumes, yet targets to reduce production costs are not being fulfilled. Profit growth indicators are lagging substantially behind plan calculations. This means that payments into the budget from profit are not taking place in full. According to our estimates the union budget has already lost 3 billion rubles in the first four months of the year. Unless this trend is stopped, over the year the losses will total 10-12 billion. So the first task is to launch a struggle against losses and extravagance.

The USSR Ministry of Finance intends to put a proposal to the USSR Supreme Soviet—to introduce from 1 July 1990 a number of legal provisions that are included in the draft Law on Taxation on Profit. The law as a whole is to come into force from 1 January 1991, but, I repeat, a number of provisions, since we are talking about an emergency situation, must be introduced without delay.

[Romanyuk] Which, precisely?

[Pavlov] First and foremost, the procedure incorporated in the draft law for taxing the consumption fund—instead of the tax on growth of the labor remuneration fund, which has not justified itself. By means of this innovation we will be linking labor remuneration directly to the growth in production volumes—without any restrictions on that growth. In conditions where production has a tendency to decline, this measure will be exceedingly appropriate. After that, we have to bring into economic circulation the accumulated uncompleted construction work and material and commodity assets. And that comes to hundreds of billions of rubles.

[Romanyuk] Do we sell them?

[Pavlov] Everyone realizes that these vast resources must be mobilized. But how? Legislative acts and management decisions are needed. All these projects were financed basically from the state budget, they are the whole people's property. And the government has to decide in principle: Can unfinished production shops be sold to private individuals, or even foreigners? Should gardeners, for instance, be given the opportunity to take away for their own needs foundations that have been built but are not being used? I believe this decision would be fully in the spirit of perestroyka. As well as the proposals to sell land and apartments to those who want to buy them.

But that is not all. The USSR Ministry of Finance believes that from 1 July 1990 it would be possible, without waiting for the new wholesale prices, to bring the ruble's purchasing power as currency into line with the reality. That could be done by setting a realistic rate for the ruble against freely convertible currency. The rate of 59 kopeks to the dollar (the official rate) is not the kind of rate that would suit our partners. Finally, we intend to seek a revision of the interest policy on deposits (the population's investments in the Savings Bank). The money that Soviet people give to the state on loan should be safely protected from devaluation and should grow as inflation grows. Then the money will stop "trickling

away." And many of these measures could be implemented by the government autonomously, on its own responsibility.

[Romanyuk] Given our more than modest income, should we perhaps moderate our expenditure? People are annoyed that despite our shortages, we are still engaged in philanthropic work abroad, giving, so to speak, international aid, bearing a "great power" burden that is beyond our powers. And what is the point of maintaining a gigantic management apparatus which reacted to the deterioration in the country's economic situation in a very original way—by increasing its own salaries.

[Pavlov] I will begin with your last point. And I will probably disappoint many people straight away: We have a comparatively cheaper state apparatus than in many countries, although it is larger. The state management apparatus with which the state budget is concerned costs the treasury only R3 billion. The main bulk of the management apparatus is employed at the enterprises: Maintaining it costs R37 billion, and here the numbers are continuing to grow. There is room for possible savings here, and considerable ones at that. We recently doubled the managers' pay, believing that a "more costly" apparatus would be reduced. But we did not achieve the expected result.

[Romanyuk] What now—treble the pay?

[Pavlov] No, we are now gambling entirely on market relations. When they have developed the labor collectives will be forced to count their money. And as for economic aid to our foreign partners, here you cannot go and cut off the oxygen supplies at a stroke. Any agreement has its conditions and duration, which are binding on us too. Furthermore we do not only grant people aid, we receive aid too. Many developed capitalist countries give us credit support. We give aid too, and we are not entitled to cancel agreements. It is another matter not to conclude new ones or take on commitments for new credits.

[Romanyuk] IZVESTIYA has cited these figures: The debt of other countries to the Soviet Union totals R85 billion. It is not easy to get this back, so should we perhaps sell the debt on the world market, as some economists propose?

[Pavlov] These credits are due to be paid off by the year 2005. The total sum to extinguish the debts comes to only R3 billion a year. Big money, but not enough to solve problems in an emergency situation. Our main potential lies in our own economy. And the USSR Ministry of Finance has no intention of operating by administrative methods in the expenditure section of the budget. But we can make money more expensive, and we intend to take steps in this direction. More expensive credit (considerably in excess of the present two to three percent) will make it possible to raise the level of effectiveness for capital investments. And we intend to secure an increase in interest rates this year, rather than waiting until next year. More expensive credit money will make economic leaders choose the most efficient projects for execution. In short, a budget policy cannot have a single all-purpose tool for every eventuality in life. That is possible only in the fairy tale about the golden key: Open the door, and you are in fairyland. In real life diverse factors operate, and they operate in close linkage.

[Romanyuk] Perhaps the country's budget should be cut in general?

[Pavlov] There are payments that we will never be able to abandon: pensions, wages for teachers and doctors, and so forth. It is possible to reduce capital investments so as to plug some of the holes. The country can stand a one-time measure. But in three years' time we will reap the consequences.

[Romanyuk] Economists propose the sale of fixed capital—if only the small enterprises, at first.

[Pavlov] To whom?

[Romanyuk] Whoever will buy them!

[Pavlov] But that would be simply a sellout. You sell them off—and what then? We do not simply need money—we need to renew the entire industrial apparatus. We have concluded or are preparing agreements with 17 states on the protection of their investments in our country. It is important to create conditions such that it is advantageous to foreign firms to invest money in creating enterprises in our countries, equipping them with leading technology, and maintaining that technology at the necessary level. It is not sufficient simply to exchange "axes for canvas." It is a question of securing an influx of capital into those spheres where it is most needed in order to boost the economy.

[Romanyuk] Is a full-blooded market economy possible in principle, in the conditions of a huge budget deficit?

[Pavlov] World practice shows that the permissible budget deficit is two to three percent. For us, that is on the order of R20 billion. The Supreme Soviet approved the state budget for 1990 with a deficit of R60 billion. For the time being we are remaining within the budget deficit norm by cutting credit investments. But I would not like to make any optimistic predictions. The economy shows a patently declining trend, which is already reflected in the size of the national income. I am not sure we will be able to remain within these limits of the budget deficit or the limit on the issuing of new money laid down for us by the Supreme Soviet. That is why we need emergency measures, which would enable us to avoid undermining an already ailing budget.

Rogachev Assesses Government Economic Program

LD1006202990 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 10 Jun 90

[Yuriy Rogachev commentary—read by announcer]

[Text] It is expected that the national parliament will resume debates of the government program to transfer to market relations. The program was presented to the current session of parliament by Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov. But even before he left the rostrum, writes our commentator Yuriy Rogachev, a people's referendum of sorts—an unofficial one—began to sweep the country.

People voted against the program by panic buying of all consumer goods. During the first two days the months stocks of food and merchandise were brought. The people didn't see in the government program a transition to a market regulation of supply and demand, to free enterprise and competition between the producers, for the buyer in general, all things that market relations imply. (?Yet) the people saw at once a government desire to solve complex problems, first of all, those relating to the huge budget deficit, at the expense of the working people. The firm promise that prices will not go up right away were of no avail. Just as the assurance that people cannot stock up for the rest of their life or the promised compensation over the prices rises.

The members of parliament also criticized the program very sharply. As a result, they returned it for further drafting to parliamentary committees and commissions. A week was given to them for the purpose and then almost another week was added. But I think that this time will not be enough to change the program drastically. But without such basic changes parliament won't pass the program in all likelihood. It's possible that alternative variants wil be considered. The fact that such variants exist was revealed by the President of the Russian Federation Boris Yeltsin, and by many prominent economists, some of whom are people's deputies of the USSR. In their view the government program does not outline effective ways to real market relations. That is, it does not break down the old administrative structure in the grip of which market relations cannot simply develop.

Prominent economists who are people's deputies of the USSR, such as Gennadiy Lisichkin, Pavel Bunich, and Nikolay Shmelev, believe that the first step towards market relations must be deregulation of the state-owned economy. That is, market relations start with privatization of property. This is the main thing. Secondly, before converting to market relations it is necessary to saturate the consumer market with goods at the expense of Western credits and imports. With the empty shops the public will not accept the price rises. Wages, salaries, pensions, and scholarships should be increased through deep cuts in defense spending, on industrial construction, on the managerial apparatus. And also through selling equipment that has not been installed and has been stocked for years at warehouses.

According to an opinion poll a majority of the population favor market relations which, as human history has proved, are the only way to ensure a normal functioning of the economy. The population is opposed to further half measures which, instead of establishing genuine market relations, will force prices up. Will we receive such a variant of converting to market relations to the satisfaction of the majority of the people? Well, we'll find out this coming week.

First Congress of Leaseholders' Opens 1 Jun

PM0606101390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 1 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" program; report by L. Khatayevich and A. Ivanova, identified by caption]

[Text] [Announcer] Now a word about our economy's problems or—more accurately—about how to create a market, how to change our economy, render it more flexible. This question was, as you know, deferred at the session, but this problem is nevertheless being discussed at various levels—at the domestic, theoretical, and practical levels. It is not only a matter of discussion, practical steps are being taken. The First Congress of Leaseholders and Entrepreneurs began its work today. In his greeting to the congress USSR President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev described the lease movement as a statewide nationwide matter.

[Reporter] As for the nationwide nature, it can be seen from the facts cited in the report delivered by Pavel Grigoryevich Bunich, president of the union [of leaseholders], that the movement is spreading rapidly. Today the union comprises about 7.5 million leaseholders and 6,000 enterprises—double the number of enterprises of three or four months ago. As for state organs, which must do their bit to accommodate the lease, leaseholders have their own viewpoint on this subject.

[Unidentified man] I expect a change of policy—if a politician is unable to restructure himself, the process of perestroyka will sweep these politicians away.

[Second unidentified man] The lease represents autonomy and I think that the congress will above all facilitate our autonomy.

[Reporter] Tax policy, cadre and planning policy, resource policy, attempts to restrict as much as possible the number of enterprises with the right to operate the lease system—that is a by no means complete list of their complaints against the apparatus. There has also been criticism of the this.

Here we have Shcherbakov, chairman of the Committee for Labor and Social Problems, and Finance Minister Pavlov.

[Pavlov] There cannot be a higher tax for the leaseholder than that paid by the cooperative worker or other sectors of the economy.

[Shcherbakov] As soon as a tax law is adopted, I am prepared to sign a State Committee for Labor and Social Problems resolution the following day giving leaseholders complete freedom in spending their money on

wages. I see very few of our colleagues here. It is a great pity. I think that it would be a good thing for them to come and listen.

[Reporter] Are you referring to your ministerial colleagues?

[Shcherbakov] Yes.

[Reporter] A quite sharp debate revolved around Pavel Grigoryevich Bunich's report. Svyatoslav Nikolayevich Fedorov, who is probably the country's largest leaseholder, took part in it.

Some 7.5 million people now work on the lease. Pavel Grigoryevich Bunich believes that 50-60 million people must pass through the lease in order to secure the changes in the economy that we are striving to achieve. So what do you say to those people who have not yet embarked on the lease?

[Fedorov] I would say that they must fight for the lease with both hands. This is a real school—if not of communism, then a school, I would say, of life, normal life, how to live like a normal person and become a free and creative worker. Move on from forced labor to free labor.

[Newscaster] Well, how can one know whether leaseholders will succeed in cranking up the fairly inert mechanism of our economy.

Bunich Interviewed

PM0506101990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 3 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast: Reportage by L. Khatayevich and A. Ivanov, identified by caption, including interview with Deputy P.G. Bunich, president of USSR Union of Leaseholders and Entrepreneurs]

[Text] [Announcer] The Congress of the USSR Union of Leaseholders and Entrepreneurs, a major organization which may become an important component of the country's emerging market economy, is ending. This is one of the last recesses in its three-day proceedings. Dozens of delegates have already spoken at plenary sessions and in sections. Nonetheless there are questions, questions, and more questions. Questions to the union's president, questions to fellow delegates, questions from the rostrum to the government.... [video shows congress proceedings with questions being asked from the floor, delegates debating among themselves] Was the congress able to answer all the questions put by delegates? Probably not. It did answer the main question, though: about the shape and nature of the union. Here is just one line from the union's statutes. They specify that entry to and withdrawal from the union are voluntary, that all its members are equal, and that its organs are elected. Consequently the Union of Leaseholders and Entrepreneurs must be a democratic organization which will operate within an equally democratic economic system. This is the conclusion reached by everyone. But each delegate has a his own perception of priorities. [video shows delegates being interviewed, followed by shots of congress proceedings]

[Unidentified delegate] There is no alternative to our leaseholders' movement in getting the economy going, and as a result the government is beginning to take note of us.

[Unidentified delegate] I see the beginnings of a real market structure in the Union of Leaseholders and Entrepreneurs—placing stress on the last word.

[Unidentified delegate] The main thing is the provision of practical assistance to leaseholders, this is what the congress has produced.

[Announcer] Practical assistance means efforts to improve existing laws and ensure the adoption of new laws which will promote the development of this movement. It means training—the union's business center will be on a par with the country's best higher educational establishments. It means the establishment of a bank to provide credits and of a concern to provide assistance in establishing foreign economic ties. The union's program is quite extensive. What is the main result of the congress as seen by the president of the Union of Leaseholders and Entrepreneurs?

[USSR People's Deputy P.G. Bunich, identified by caption] The main result of the congress is that we have met each other, that we have seen 800 very committed, very energetic people, it's most inspiring. That is the first result. The second result is that we have heard so many different suggestions, so many different proposals that we simply cannot adopt the relevant resolutions in the course of one day. We need two to three weeks for this. There will be a resolution addressed to the Supreme Soviet, and there will be an address to the president and an address to the people, mainly to the future leaseholders and entrepreneurs, that is.

[Correspondent] The congress has ended, what will happen next?

[Bunich] What will come next is what went before the congress, a lot of hard work and struggle to ensure that this, the biggest free sector in the Soviet economy, becomes truly free.

[Newscaster] Let me add that a proposal was forward at the congress to remove leasing from the jurisdiction of ministries and departments and to establish a special administration for state property whose task it would be to realistically assess the property that is being leased. Thus what leaseholders are demanding is legitimate independence, the right themselves to decide the wages of their staff, and the right to write off debts which incurred by collectives prior to leasing and for which leaseholders cannot be held responsible.

Leningrad Plant Converts to Civil Air Production

LD0906221190 Moscow World Service in English 1100 GMT 9 Jun 90

[Text] A plant in Leningrad which until recently filled orders for the country's Air Force has begun to build engines for passenger planes. The 60-seat Ilyushin-114 plane, whose engines were built by the defense plant, has carried out its first test flights. This year plants belonging to the Soviet military-industrial complex will double their output for civil aviation. Many of them will start building new, more economical, and safer passenger and cargo planes.

Ekoprom Consortium Plans To Combat Pollution

LD0706210990

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1430 GMT on 7 June, in its "Vremya" newscast, broadcasts a two-minute video report by Ye. Blokhin from the first working meeting of the Ekoprom consortium which took place in Moscow on 7 June. He begins by noting that the consortium's main aim is to improve the ecological situation for the better in the country in the next few years. Video shows the meeting in progress.

The participants in the meeting say that it is no longer possible to postpone tackling this question: There is on average 340 kg per annum of harmful waste per Soviet person (video shows cars and trucks driving on road, a factory chimney) and in a few regions it is no longer possible to use water even from artesian wells. At the same time only one per cent of the country's budget is being spent on nature protection. Even these funds are not being used in full a speaker says. It was in order to speed up the production of new ecological equipment that this consortium was set up by a decision of the USSR Council of Ministers. Defense enterprises, which are being released as a result of conversion, will take part in working out new technologies. A wish to cooperate with Ekoprom has already been expressed by firms from the United States, the FRG, the Netherlands, Italy, and Sweden.

Blokhin then interviews A.I. Chabanov, president of the Ekoprom consortium, in the meeting hall, asking him whether enterprises will spend their funds on the purchase of equipment which Ekoprom will produce. Chabanov says they undoubtedly will, inasmuch as new economic mechanisms are being brought into play: Above all, he says, on the one hand, the taxation system will encourage investment of money in ecological equipment. On the other hand, there is now a system of large fines for enterprises exceeding the maximum permissible concentration in their discharges into water or into the atmosphere. Therefore enterprises will be interested in purchasing equipment to protect the environment for economic reasons.

Taking part in the first meeting of the Ekoprom consortium are Comrades Balkanov and Silayev. Video shows Balkanov, Silayev.

Single Body To Issue Export, Import Licenses

PM0806143090 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Jun 90 Second Edition p 2

[Reply by I. Pyshkin, senior official on the apparatus of the USSR Council of Ministers State Foreign Economic Commission, to readers' questions: "Licenses All From One Source"—first two paragraphs are PRAVDA introduction]

[Text] Some of our readers who are involved in foreign economic activity are asking whether it is proposed to set up some kind of extradepartmental state organ which will issue licenses for export and import operations.

I. Pyshkin, senior official on the apparatus of the USSR Council of Ministers State Foreign Economic Commission, explains:

The question of creating a single interdepartmental organ which would be responsible for resolving questions of foreign economic licensing is indeed being examined. The USSR Council of Ministers State Foreign Economic Commission held conferences on this question 12 April and 11 May, with the participation of representatives of interested ministries and departments, as well as the union republic Councils of Ministers.

Various views were put forward on the tasks, functions, structure, and powers of this organ and its relationship with the union republic governments and territorial organs of administration. This question is now being studied at the State Foreign Economic Commission, the USSR Gosplan [State Planning Committee] and Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations, the union republic Councils of Ministers, and the interested ministries, and proposals for the formation of such an organ are being drawn up. They are expected to be submitted to the government in June.

This organ, it is planned, will resolve these main tasks: setting quotas and issuing licenses for the exportation from the USSR and importation to the USSR of goods (work, services) within the system of division of responsibilities between the Union as a whole and the interested union republics, on the basis of a single countrywide customs territory; preparing proposals for the government for the imposition (amendment) of special types of customs duty (seasonal, special, antidumping, compensatory); issuing certificates to organizations engaged in the provision of consultative and information services in the sphere of foreign economic ties, including joint enterprises, on the basis of the depth and reliability of the said information.

Why do we need an interdepartmental organ?

First, this approach conforms to general world practice and is generally in accordance with the Soviet Union's international commitments and the GATT rules. Second, it is necessary in order to protect the interests of

the country as a whole. Every state protects its domestic market and makes commitments to other states not to harm their markets.

Finally, this organ is called upon to put an end to the monopoly of ministries and departments, which often unjustifiably refuse to issue export or import licenses to their potential competitors or deliberately prolong the procedure. This leads to disruptions in meeting orders and the breaking of contracts, and to the loss of markets for our country's other exporters. Let me remind you that today the licensing of export and import operations is carried out in our country by a total of more than 50 organs—ministries and departments, union republic governments, and social organizations.

The USSR Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations in effect licenses exports and imports only of basic goods of statewide significance, such as petroleum and gas, metal and ore, grain and coal. Today it is the sectors that set the tone in this sphere. PRAVDA's readers doubtless know what that leads to. Let me remind you, for instance, of your own item "Throwing Slush at a Rival," in the 21 May issue, which describes how the monopoly on licensing mineral fertilizer exports "works."

On the other hand, it is wrong to go to the other extreme, as was the case, for instance, with exports of fertilizers again (carbamide) in 1987. At that time our exporters flooded the U.S. market with carbamide at prices that were extremely low in comparison with world prices, and the American government had to impose a special antidumping duty on deliveries of this product from the USSR. In this connection I also remember the story of how we once "dumped" tomato paste all over Europe, also at low prices. I could cite many other examples of Soviet exporters acting incompetently, competing with one another, reducing prices for goods, and destroying the market.

A single interdepartmental organ should put an end to the departments' monopoly and help increase the efficiency of foreign economic activity in the period of transition to the market economy.

Let me add that it is proposed to back up this work with a substantial information base with the help of the Integrated Foreign Economic Information System that is now being created.

FRG Food Shipments Delayed in Transport

904D0137A Moscow TRUD in Russian 2 Jun 90 p 4

[Article by Ye. Zbruyev, Leningrad: "'Undischarged' Import Goods"]

[Text] **Back in February TRUD reported that the government of the FRG provided DM220 million worth of meat and other products free of charge to our country. Where are they?**

Here is the answer that was given at the "Prodintorg" All-Union Foreign Trade Association:

According to data on 28 May, of 2,000 tons of canned beef stew, practically everything was shipped; of 5,000 tons of cheese—4,700 tons; of 21,800 tons of butter—20,900; of 53,000 tons of beef—36,000; of 50,000 tons of pork—27,500; and finally, of 15,000 tons of dried whole milk, 9,500 tons have been shipped.

The delay in the milk is explained by the fact that there is a chronic shortage of containers for its shipment from the Rotterdam seaport. But the milk will be shipped by August or sooner.

The deliveries of meat have been slow for many reasons: There is a shortage of transport on both sides, and much time has been lost through negotiations with the veterinary services of both sides. The situation is worsened by the low traffic capacity of our seaports and a shortage of refrigerator ships, wagons, and workers. On the whole, 24 ships with 130,000 tons of undischarged meat and dairy "imports," and not only from the FRG, have accumulated at ports around the country.

And where is the meat, butter, and cheese that we received? Here is what the USSR Ministry of Trade responded:

The meat, which as a rule is supplied in half-carcasses, is sent for processing into sausage (in the form of supplements) in Moscow, Leningrad, and the Central Asian and Transcaucasian republics. The butter, which is supplied in blocks, is sent for the most part to Moscow and Leningrad, and the majority of the cheese and stew is sold at food distribution points in the enterprises. But one may also find German cheese in the stores...

Kamchatka Fisheries Switching to Market Relations

LD0606111490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 3 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] I will cite just two figures—more than 80 percent of total output in Kamchatka Oblast is accounted for by the fishery industry, and more than R1 billion in annual production is earned from fish and sea products by the many-thousand strong collective of fishery and cannery workers of the Kamchatka fishery association.

Fish stocks in the seas and oceans adjoining the Kamchatka Peninsula fully belong, as it were, to the mighty USSR Ministry of Fish Industry. In other words, for many years the Ministry of Fish Industry has been the total master of the Kamchatka shelf. At the same time, Kamchatka Oblast almost completely relies on this sector.

[Correspondent V. Plotskiy in Kamchatka—identified by caption] As the new chairman of the oblast executive committee, with the new membership of the executive committee, you have to resolve questions in connection with the switch to market relations.

[V.A. Biryukov, chairman of the Kamchatka Oblast executive committee—identified by caption] We cherish the fish industry; without its products and, maybe, the rubles which it brings to the table... naturally, we cannot remain passive in such a situation; if such a situation were allowed to go further it would bring us ruin—a crisis, on the economy as a whole in the oblast, on the development of industrial enterprises and, particularly a crisis on us, on the life and the security of the oblast's population.

We will strive to ensure that obsolete fishery production methods are removed in the republic and everybody participates in shaping our market relations. That is our firm position.

We are now working on a mechanism so that, jointly with the Ministry of Fish Industry, we can devise methods of participation by the fishery industry in shaping market relations in the oblast. [video shows "Aleksey Stakhanov" fishing vessel, fishing production methods]

Moscow's Severnaya TETS Project Abandoned

PM0806130090 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 6 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast: Reportage by A. Konstantinov, identified by caption, from Moscow's Severnaya heat and electric power station construction site]

[Text] [Announcer] Another report from Moscow. So the Severnaya TETS [heat and electric power station] is not to be. The first Moscow City Soviet session has adopted a decision to stop the construction work; Moscow City Soviet also submitted to the republican government, or rather, the USSR Council of Ministers, a proposal to stop financing all work connected with the construction of the TETS.

[Konstantinov, speaking over video of construction site, trucks driving through mud, piles of construction materials] Everything comes to an end, including such a widely publicized and costly project as the Severnaya TETS. Only recently this construction project was being called the biggest in Europe—after all, we cannot build anything that is not epoch-making. But today, having heard about the decision, the will of the Muscovites, the inhabitants of the nearby villages, as the recent song used to say, have received the right to breathe freely. But the leadership of this project thinks that there has been a mistake. Giving way to populist moods in the desire to boost their popularity rating, the people's deputies were simply led on by an ecologically ignorant and selfish population. By way of proof, figures are cited. More than R53 million has been assimilated, and uninstalled equipment and structural components worth another four million are lying around. [video shows building materials lying on the ground] In the event of a cold winter, they believe, apartments will be icy. But if I am to express my own sympathies honestly, I am inclined to side with the population, who may not know very much about ecology, but are wise about other matters, having learned, perhaps, from the bitter decades when considerable, uncontrolled discharges resulted in tragedies and the culprits escaped responsibility.

Incidentally, about responsibility. Several hundred millions were spent on the erection of the Crimean AES [nuclear power station]. Who squandered this wealth? We do not know. Under pressure from the people, construction of the Voronezh AES was stopped, and again, no culprits were identified. Another waste of money, this time amounting to tens of millions, near Moscow, and the same result. [video shows a pipe with graffiti reading "No to the TETS"]

If in no other respect, when it comes to the dictatorship of anonymous and faceless industry, we are more experienced than anyone else in the world.

Car Factory Feels Rolled Metal Shortage

LD1006012890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0600 GMT 9 Jun 90

[Text] An alarming report has reached us from the Moskvich production association. Here is an item from our correspondent Svetlana Parkhomenko.

[Parkhomenko] I am at the Lenin Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] car plant in Moscow. There is an exceptional situation here at the moment: There is no rolled metal at the plant. The factory may grind to a complete standstill. Yesterday, there was a warning strike in the body- welding shop. The workers were tired of standing around and losing earnings.

I am now in pressing shop No. 4, and the person I am speaking with here is production line adjuster Vladimir Alekseyevich Ryzhov.

Vladimir Alekseyevich, it is precisely in your shop that the shortage of rolled metal is making itself particularly felt. How are you working at the moment?

[Ryzhov] Yes, you are right. As regards metal, we are the ones who are sometimes holding up the body workers. The metal is delivered in an untimely manner, not on schedule, that is. Very poor quality metal is being supplied, which, in earlier times, in theory, I have never seen used for external car parts.

[Parkhomenko] I am now in the office of Mikhail Ilarionovich Serikov, commercial director of the Moskvich production association.

[Serikov] A rather difficult situation has developed at the plant. It is explained by the fact that, up to the present, payments are not being made by the Soviet side for deliveries of metal and chemical produce, and, accordingly, foreign firms have stopped delivering materials that were being purchased. There is no possibility of getting alternative materials from Soviet enterprises. A number of enterprises have no capacity, and a whole

series of materials have simply not been assimilated by Soviet industry. So, our attempts to turn to our ministry, the USSR State Committee for Material and Technical Supply, and the Council of Ministers find no positive decisions. No one is saying how the question of the further work of the factory will be tackled.

[Parkhomenko] What is now being done directly by the factory management?

[Serikov] The factory management is taking the following measures. People have gone out on more than one occasion to the metallurgical combine to try to find joint solutions on mutually advantageous terms, to increase the volume of orders that we have, and to attempt to bring the rolled-metal production schedule forward from the third quarter to the second quarter. Unfortunately, this task cannot be fully accomplished owing to the lack of capacity, and the overloading of Soviet enterprises.

Miners Strike Committee Resumption Proposed

904F0171A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 25 May 90 p 1

[Article by A. Parshintsev: "If a Spark Flares Up"]

[Text] Kemerovo Oblast—The Kuzbass Council of Workers Committees has addressed the labor collectives with a proposal to resume the activities of the strike committees at enterprises and in the cities and to create new ones where they did not previously exist.

What has given rise to such a step?

"The time that has passed since last year proves convincingly that we have achieved practically nothing by putting forward economic demands," said A. Kutlakhmetov, a member of the regional council of workers committees. "The situation in the miners cities is tense. Supply of food and consumer items has become quite poor."

"What will a new strike give you?"

"The regional council is convinced that no one will profit by it. We are trying to have our demands met peacefully—through the soviets of people's deputies. But a spark could flare up at any moment and, just like last year, a chain reaction across the coal regions of the country could take place.

"We proposed to the workers committees that they develop measures for conducting a strike, should one arise, in order to keep it from being spontaneous. Strike committees are needed for such an unpredictable situation."

Miners Debate Union Congress Agenda, Venue

904F0178A Moscow TRUD in Russian 5 Jun 90 p 2

[Article by TRUD correspondent N. Mokrishchev: "Passions Flared Up"]

[Text] Donetsk—When will there be a congress of miners? The answer, it would seem, is clear: at the end of July and the beginning of August of this year. That is what was decided by the 25th Congress of the Coal Industry Workers Trade Union that was held just two months ago. This period was confirmed afterwards by the participants in the first plenum of the central council of the industrial trade union during discussions on the conduct of a new miners' forum. And then within a month after this, at a visiting meeting of the second plenum of the central council in Gorlovka, it became necessary once again to express one's attitude toward the forthcoming miners' conference. And in the process, a stormy discussion lasted more than four hours this time.

We recall that everyone—and not one measure managed to do without the broad participation of the strike committees—agreed both to the periods of the convocation and the agenda of the special 25th Congress of Trade Unions held in March, and to the procedure for electing delegates to it. But many strike committee leaders, and also members of the state-public commissions for monitoring the execution of decree No. 6 of the Council of Ministers, were not elected as delegates by the miners.... However, they were invited to Moscow. They demanded that they be granted power as delegates. The congress refused. Then the aggrieved walked out of the meeting hall in protest and began actively preparing to hold a new congress.

At the coordination council of the regional union of strike committees of the Donbas, it was decided to hold a congress on 11-15 June. No consultations on this score were held with anyone, and the question was not discussed in the miner collectives. This turn of events was a surprise both for the Ministry of the Coal Industry and for the trade union central council.

But this, as the saying goes, is half the trouble. The main thing is that it is also planned to discuss what decisions are being proposed.

A document that was distributed at the plenum of the central council in Gorlovka will give transparent answers to this. Included as a main item on the agenda was a paragraph on the creation of an independent and free trade union of the underground workers, the so-called "Miners' League."

"It is necessary for us to come to an agreement at the congress," this document states, "concerning our own banner and symbols. Each member of the 'Miners' League,' if this league becomes a militant organization, will also wear with pride the badge that denotes membership in a special caste of workers (spacing is mine—author)."

It is proposed that the color of the banner be black, which should symbolize "black gold," the black color of the face, and the miners' black overalls. True, a qualification is made that this color may put many on guard, associating it with the banner of the anarchists, but it is

necessary, they say, to explain to people that this black color is a symbol of freedom.

Denoted among the most immediate objectives and tasks of the "Miners' League" are: the abolition of piece-rate pay for work and the introduction of high hourly rates, the abolition of socialist emulation, all types of fines for misdemeanors committed outside the enterprise, collective responsibility for discipline, and a ban on compulsory unpaid work on services and utilities, agricultural work, vegetable bases, etc. The establishment of an insurance fund in the event of a strike is envisaged.

Real squabbles broke out. Participants in the plenum spoke heatedly about the fact that the establishment of a separate trade union for underground workers is a far-fetched and harmful action. That it is directed at a breakdown in the unity and solidarity of the miners. It is intended to involve trade unions in fruitless discussions and distract the workers of the industry from resolving living problems of vital importance, and it is a threat of new strikes.

"The question arises, from whom do they plan to make underground workers independent?" said V. Lunev, chairman of the central council. "From ground-level and mine transport workers? From their own ITR [engineer technical workers]? And to what trade union will the workers of miner dispatcher control and libraries, sports and children's facilities, and trade and construction 'belong?' Therefore, we propose to prepare and discuss the draft of a provision concerning associations inside a single trade union, and the right to an association which not only underground workers can use...."

The idea of a split is also not supported by members of the Donetsk territorial trade union committee, two-thirds of which consist of mine representatives, and whose elected chairman is V. Ladygin, a radically thinking and acting tunneler who frankly does not tolerate any kind of ruts and sluggishness.

Here are two more harsh opinions:

Yu. Ivanov, chairman of the Belovo trade union territorial committee:

"Enough of the pulling down! It is time to create. We should not convene a congress in order to settle personal scores."

S. Bradulov, coal mining face worker of the Yenakiyevo mine "Red International Trade Union:"

"We understood that decree No. 608 will not be fully implemented: What is done is done, and we must stop. This is also understood by members of the state public commission for monitoring its fulfillment. But what are they to do now, if they do not organize some kind of a fuss? You see, they do not want to return to their jobs....

"The central council approved an appeal to all members of the coal industry trade union. It contains a call against a trade union split and against changing it from a single, viable organization into a collection of closed shop formations that are bound to degenerate. Because when the implacable laws of the market economy go into effect, as never before there will be a need for solidarity and a consolidation of all miner detachments—otherwise we will not be able to defend ourselves and our economic interests.... The plenum decided to hold a congress of miners not in June, but in the middle of August, and not in Donetsk, but in Moscow."

Despite this, Donetsk strike committee members Yu. Boldyrev and A. Kolomiytsev announced: The congress, nevertheless, will be held in Donetsk and will open on 11 June, and an invitation to it has already been received by 25 trade union representatives abroad....

And preparation for the congress is in full swing. V. Filenko, a mine tunneler of the Vorkuta mine "Yun-Yaga" and representative of the organizational committee, has been in Donetsk for two weeks already. Invitations have been sent to all mines in the country. Work is proceeding on the election of delegates only from among workers. The arrival of 800 persons is expected. Rooms have been reserved in hotels. An agreement has been reached on leasing a large hall in the Youth Palace "Youth."

"If we want radical changes in the life of miners, then we must understand clearly that the organization and conduct of the congress cannot be entrusted to the official trade union," Filenko asserted in an interview with the oblast newspaper SOTSIALISTICHESKIY DONBASS. "Because it is led by bureaucrats, and it is not capable of completely defending the interests of the workers...."

But for the most part, the trade union organization of miners is headed by new people who were elected in a democratic way, and who came forth on a wave of strikes. Many of them, before they became the heads of committees, worked in mine excavations. And now, if you please, only several months have passed, and attempts are already being made to label them "yes-men," apparatchiks, and bureaucrats. Does not the same fate also await the future leaders of the "Miners' League," if such an organization is formed?

Scientific

Cosmonauts Mark 4 Months in Orbit

LD1106202190 Moscow TASS in English 1953 GMT 11 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Rena Kuznetsova]

[Text] Moscow June 11 TASS—Today it is four months of the work in orbit by Soviet cosmonauts Anatoliy Solovyev and Aleksandr Balandin. Following a check-up of the airtightness of the docking assembly, they opened transfer hatches and began to reactivate the specialised technological module Kristall.

In accordance with the programme, the module today redocked from the axial docking port of the transfer compartment of the station to a lateral one. All this was done automatically by means of the module's manipulator. The operation was monitored by the mission control centre and the crew.

Following the lift-off, the module stayed in orbit for ten days before docking with the long-duration orbital complex Mir. The first attempt to dock with the complex, scheduled for June 6, failed.

Following the first engine ignition at the designated time, there was no second ignition owing to malfunction of one of the orientation system engines. In view of that, the docking was postponed until June 10. Instead of the malfunctioning engine, a stand-by set of engines was ignited and functioned properly.

Before their space expedition is over, the cosmonauts are hoping to launch space technology work on the equipment of the module which experts refer to as a "microfactory in orbit" for the production of high-purity semiconductor crystals.

According to preliminary estimates by scientists, a sufficient amount of high quality semi-conductors may be produced on board the module within three years to pay back the expenditures on the development and launch of the module.

According to schedule, the crew are to begin producing semi-conductor materials on the Krater installation on June 15.

Besides, the cosmonauts continue to implement an extensive programme for nature study, medico-biological, astronomical, and astrophysical research and experiments.

Deputies, Officials Visit Semipalatinsk Test Site

LD1106121290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] A group of deputies from the USSR Supreme Soviet, representatives of the USSR Council of Ministers, as well as experts from the State Committee for Hydrometrology and from the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Atomic Power and Industry visited the state central test site near Semipalatinsk 8-10 June. In connection with the drawing up of a decision by the Government of the Soviet Union on the further implementation of a program of nuclear tests, they studied the situation at the nuclear test site and around it.

Deputies Tour Site

LD1106155590 Moscow TASS in English 1511 GMT 11 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Yuriy Rublevskiy]

[Text] Moscow June 11 TASS—USSR people's deputies from the group Soyuz have described their stay at the Semipalatinsk state-run central nuclear test site, eastern Kazakhstan, as a "walk in the fresh air."

For two days they familiarised themselves with the operation of the test site and the living conditions of the inhabitants in nearby areas and returned to Moscow on Sunday.

The law-makers' trip to the test site was prompted by letters, statements and remarks, including those in the USSR Supreme Soviet, by a number of deputies accusing nuclear scientists, as well as by contradictory articles in the Soviet media concerning the test site operation.

The Kazakhstan Council of Ministers and the Supreme Soviet decided to close down the test site immediately. Central authorities will now have their final say. The trip by USSR people's deputies to the city of Kurchatov, the existence of which was known only by a limited circle of nuclear experts only five years ago, fits into this context.

Accompanied by specialists, equipped with apparatus to gauge radiation levels and environmental pollution, the members of parliament toured those places where the tests of nuclear weapons and devices had been carried out, and visited research laboratories.

Among the inspected facilities were wells and galleries, in which underground nuclear tests were carried out only recently, an artificial lake, brought into being by a directed nuclear blast, and the "experimental field" where the first Soviet nuclear and hydrogen bombs had been tested.

The deputies and the TASS correspondent accompanying them during the tour saw for themselves that radiation level in the wells and galleries was up to universally accepted norms while that at the sites of surface and air burst carried out at the test site before 1962 is five to six times as high as permissible levels. Those places are fenced off to prevent people and even cattle from entering them.

The deputies exchanged opinons with representatives of the military, party and local government authorities of the city of Kurchatov about the future destiny of the test site.

Participants in the meeting declared in favor of general and complete cessation of nuclear tests. But they believe that the closure of the Semipalatinsk test site at a time when nuclear tests do not cease and even increase in other countries may entail serious consequences for the Soviet Union's security and for Soviet nuclear science.

They voiced complaints addressed to the Soviet central government which "shows a certain constraint when faced with pressure from a number of Kazakh leaders and members of parliament who press for closing down the test site guided by a desire to make political capital disregarding state interests."

At the same time participants at the meeting spoke out in favour of paying compensations to the population who

experienced the consequences of surface and air nuclear bursts carried out at Semipalatinsk test site before 1962.

Underground nuclear detonations are conducted with the strictest ensurance of a whole number of measures ruling out harm to the health of the test site personnel and the inhabitants of nearby villages, Yuriy Tsaturov, deputy chairman of the State Committee for Hydrometeorology, told TASS.

More than 300 observation stations and laboratories of the committee in Semipalatinsk region and neighbouring ones point out that the content of radio-active products in the air, water and land there is the same as in other regions of the Soviet Union, such as, for example, in Biysk, Alma-Ata, or Moscow region.

Underground explosions may be conducted because they are necessary. In order to reduce the seismic effect which influences the population's mental health, the yield of nuclear weapons could be lowered, Tsaturov believes.

USSR People's Deputy Anatoliy Andreyev also believes that it is necessary to go on testing nuclear weapons in the interests of the Soviet Union's security.

"I stand for a continuation of the operation of the Semipalatinsk test site and I believe that the government should immediately determine its attitude towards the issue," he told TASS.

This afternoon the deputies who returned from the city of Kurchatov were expected to hold a conference for Soviet and foreign journalists.

Deputies Meet Press

LD1106171590 Moscow TASS in English 1702 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 11 TASS—Underground nuclear tests, conducted at the Semipalatinsk nuclear test site, are absolutely safe to the inhabitants of the nearby regions of Kazakhstan, USSR people's deputies, who returned here after a two-day trip to the test site, told a news conference here today. The idea of the trip was put forward by Colonel Nikolay Petrushenko, one of activists of the deputies' group Soyuz.

The deputies believe that the veil of secrecy that for a long time concealed the operation of the test site from the public eye led to widespread radiophobia, to a situation when people cease to believe any official information.

In addition, it is advantageous to the leadership of the republic to explain a high sickness rate among the local population by the effect of radiation while in actual fact the causes are in malnutrition, the undeveloped nature of the social sphere and the appalling ecological situation, Galina Fomenko, member of the parliamentary Committee for Women's Affairs, and other participants in the trip believe.

Participants in the news conference emphasised that inhabitants of some areas were really exposed to radiation in 1949-1963 when air nuclear tests were conducted.

However, none of local residents fell ill with radiation sickness as a result of nuclear tests, Lieutenant General Sergey Zelentsov, a spokesman for the USSR Defence Ministry, told journalists.

Radiation background in areas surrounding the test site is now not more than 20 micro-roentgen an hour, which is within norm (radiation background in Moscow is 18 micro-roentgen an hour), he said.

However, not all people's deputies of the USSR are convinced of he "harmlessness" of the Semipalatinsk test site. Another commission of deputies led by Yuriy Shcherbak, member of the parliamentary Committee for Ecology visited the test site in January this year. Shcherbak is known for his efforts towards making public all consequences of the Chernobyl disaster.

Upon returning from the Semipalatinsk test site, Shcherbak said that there was an indisputable link between nuclear tests and an increased rate of cancer diseases and psycho-neurotic disorders, a shortened life expectancy, and a decline in the natural immunity in children.

Following the recent decisions by the Kazakhstan parliament and government to immediately close the test site down, the situation has become aggravated still further.

The Defence Ministry-suggested gradual transfer of tests to the Novaya Zemlya Soviet test site is, naturally, giving rise to protests among the population of the Soviet Union's northern areas.

'Psychological' Illnesses Noted

LD1106223690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] A press conference of the people's deputies who have returned from their visit to the region of the Semipalatinsk test range took place today at the USSR Supreme Soviet. Listen to an excerpt from the speech made by Yuliya Yuryevna Sokolova, secretary of the Committee for Glasnost.

[Begin Sokolova recording] We had many opportunities to become acquainted with different activities at the test range, to meet also the test range scientists, the citizens of the town of Kurchatov, the leadership of the Semipalatinsk Oblast Party Committee and to look at Semipalatinsk's medical establishments, to meet specialists in medicine who work in the oblast. But before the visit took place we had quite a long conversation with Professor (Isib), an eminent specialist in the field of radiobiology and medicine, who once worked in Semipalatinsk Oblast at the head of a very large group, the special medical commission, and who came to his own conclusions regarding people's health, their diseases, the

reasons for those diseases, and an analysis of this situation. We were trying to prepare ourselves to some extent for the visit. We were alarmed because of the very diverse reports about how the health of those who live in the test range region suffers.

We were armed with dosimeters. We flew over the test range. We landed where we thought it was necessary. We measured radiation everywhere, but to tell the truth, the radiation levels everywhere—in the places where people live and in the places of the test range where they do not live—was sometimes far less than in Moscow. I think that the excessive outburst of emotions in connection with life at the test range and the consequences of its activities—this very long silence, absense of information—led to misinformation, to pyschosomatic fears, which probably affected people's health. I think that because of such emotional tension, those fears, a person who is gullible concerning unproved information can become ill. That is one point. Another is the inadequate diet of children and women, generally of those who live near the test range zone, in the rayons alongside our nuclear test range. There are no vitamins at all.

When you are approaching the town of Semipalatinsk when it is cold, and when all 299 bolier shops are working—please note that there are 299 in such a small town—using very unclean coal, basically carcinogenic coal, it becomes possible to imagine what the air is like in this town, what the children of the town breathe, what children, women, men, old people breathe.

So, in order to make such absolute conclusions about the ruinous influence of the test range on the health of the people, we have to be well armed with data. The social sphere of those who live in the rest range zone needs revizing. Special investments are needed to make the medical care for these citizens, their diet and their living conditions much better. This means that the very fact of living next to some kind of a risk zone—we can not deny that a person feels that the rest range is somewhere nearby, even psychologically—ought to be compensated, not just by some sum of money, but also by his living conditions, which have to defend him from many negative factors, including factors of a psychological nature. [end recording]

Military

USSR Airspace Violated South of Batumi 9 Jun

Defense Ministry Issues Statement

LD1106180990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1738 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, 11 Jun (TASS)—The USSR Ministry of Defense issued the following statement today:

"On 9 June the airspace of the USSR was violated by a light aircraft south of Batumi, from the direction of Turkey. The aircraft flew at low attitude along the line of the border, outside the zone of visibility of the means of air defense reconnaissance, and reached the Ministry of Civil Aviation airfield in Batumi. The nature of the flight leaves no doubt of its provocative aim.

Due to the short time that the violating aircraft remained in USSR airspace, the air defense means did not go into action. On the way back, the aircraft was fired at by a border detail using small arms.

A statement on the given incident has been made to the Turkish side.

FRG Citizen Extends Greetings

PM1106221590 Moscow TRUD in Russian 12 Jun 90 p 2

[Unattributed report: "Do We Only Dream About the Border?; An Unidentified Aicraft Lands in Batumi"]

[Excerpt] As our correspondent reported, last Saturday between 1500 and 1600 hrs local time a small private aircraft landed at Batumi airport.

The pilot who got out of the plane introduced himself as an FRG citizen. Having greeted the group of curious onlookers who gathered round the aircraft, he handed them flowers, a visiting card, and some kind of note. In the note he expressed himself, they say, in favor of perestroyka and greeted Gorbachev.

Z. Patladze, first deputy chairman of the Adzhar Council of Ministers, confirmed that the aircraft had landed but did not communicate any details.

In order to clarify the situation we got in touch with the staff of the country's Air Defense Forces. And here too, though the fact of the unusual visit was not denied, we were not given any additional information. I. Tretyak, commander in chief of the country's Air Defense Forces said that many questions so far remain unclear. But it is simply impossible to detect such a small flying apparatus with the means of the Air Defense Forces.

When this issue was being signed to press a report came in from the USSR Defense Ministry. It says the following: [passage omitted comprising previous item minus introductory first paragraph]

Rocket Forces Communists Concerned About Situation

PM0706120990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 7 Jun 90 First Edition p 1

[Lieutenant Colonel S. Strukov report: "Delegates Elected"]

[Text] The Strategic Rocket Forces' first party conference has been held. Preliminary working meetings were held between delegates and troop leaders, and "round-tables" were held with the participation of Colonel General G. Stefanovskiy, deputy chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate.

A report at the conference was delivered by Colonel General V. Rodin, member of the Military Council and chief of the Strategic Rocket Forces Political Directorate. The report and the speeches by delegates Ye. Nazarov, Yu. Loskutov, M. Lupach, and others noted that the forthcoming CPSU congress will be a major political event on the road to humane and democratic socialism. The Rocket Forces' communists view the draft CPSU Central Committee Platform and draft new Statutes as conceptual documents providing a balanced and critical analysis of the state of affairs in the party and defining the main guidelines on the path to resolving highly acute socioeconomic, political, and ideological problems. At the same time, the need to do further work on a number of provisions was noted. The delegates expressed concern about the prevailing situation in the country and stressed that the Rocket Forces' communists recognize their personal responsibility for the fate of perestroyka, the state of affairs among the troops, and the implementation of military reform.

The conference elected delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress on a contested basis.

The delegates were addressed by Army General Yu. Maksimov, commander in chief of the Strategic Rocket Forces and USSR deputy defense minister.

I. Kovyrin, sector chief at the CPSU Central Committee State and Law Department, took part in the conference's work.

Krivosheyev Views Problems of Spring Draft

PM0806134590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 8 Jun 90 First Edition p 2

[Article by Colonel General G. Krivosheyev, deputy chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff: "Who Is Trying To Wreck the Spring Draft?"]

[Text] The latest call-up of young people for active conscription service is at its height. Everything seems to be normal. But many of the 1990 spring draft's features are substantially different from previous ones. Whereas in the past the draft was implemented on orders by the USSR minister of defense, this is the first time it is conducted on the basis of a USSR Council of Ministers resolution. This means a fundamental change in the role played and responsibility borne by republic, oblast, city, and rayon soviets of people's deputies, their relevant commissions, and their executive committees for the successful performance of a most important state task associated with young people's preparation for military service and conscription.

Military service in our country has always been seen as a duty that is not necessarily easy but honorable to the utmost. Young people themselves strove to undergo schooling by the Army and Navy. This desire was founded on civic awareness, the romanticism associated with military labor, and the wish to supplement vocational skills, undergo physical tempering, and pass the test of military life's hardships. This desire is certainly present among our young people to this day. The proper implementation of the spring draft in most of the country's rayons was a manifestation of this desire and the result of more active work done by party and soviet organs and military commissariats. According to data at our disposal, at present the draft is being most successfully implemented in Brest, Voronezh, Dnepropetrovsk, and Chernigov Oblasts and Stavropol Kray. This is an important positive feature of the current draft. There are, unfortunately, some other aspects which are directly opposite in meaning and orientation.

The Army today is the real force which can raise an insurmountable obstacle to block the familiar designs by sundry separatist, extremist, and nationalist groupings. This is why their leaders will hesitate at nothing to eliminate this obstacle.

As a rule, attempts to influence young people already in the ranks of the Armed Forces are failures. Approaches by some people's fronts, trying to persuade servicemen of their nationality to desert, have been virtually fruitless. Such appeals are not welcomed in military subunits. This is only natural. Young people, familiar with service and army life at first hand, refuse to believe sundry fabrications and slanders.

This is why the main attack is now targeted on young draftees. The target has been deliberately picked: Teenagers, unfamiliar with the army and often lacking stable guidelines in life, are more inclined than anyone else to give credence to emotional appraisals and radically demagogic slogans. Arguments which find no support among soldiers and sergeants frequently work among teenagers. This is no surprise, bearing in mind that members of people's front aktivs threaten draftees wishing to serve in the Armed Forces with different forms of punishment and proclaim them to be "traitors of the nation's interests."

There is simultaneous and intensive indoctrination of parents, physicians on draft commissions, and representatives of republican and local organs of power. Threats of physical violence and insults are addressed to military commissariat staffers.

Consequently, the news from some of the country's regions reads like reports from theaters of combat operations. An illumination rocket flare was fired at a window of the military commissariat in Siauliai, Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic], during the night of 8-9 April, a fire started, and considerable material damage was caused at the military commissariat. A group of unknown persons attacked the Tartu City Military Commissariat in the evening on 23 April, none of the attackers was detained. The military commissariat sign in the city of Rapla, Estonian SSR, was torn down and broken to pieces 24 April. The building of Pasvalskiy Rayon Military Commissariat in the Lithuanian SSR is being picketed for the second week running, with draftees being threatened that their homes will be burned

down unless they refuse to serve in the Soviet Army. Military commissariats are also picketed in the cities of Lvov, Stryy, Ivano-Frankovsk, and others.

Baltic republic newspapers publishing in the Estonian, Lettish, and Lithuanian languages have to this day not published the USSR Council of Ministers resolution on the latest conscription of citizens for active military service. Under pressure by people's fronts, the governments of these republics have not adopted their own decisions on the spring draft's implementation. Consequently, local organs refuse to fulfill the union resolution.

Furthermore, acts that are essentially anticonstitutional have been ratified by Supreme Soviets in some republics. The Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet adopted 11 April a law "On Service by Estonian SSR Residents in the USSR Armed Forces During the Transition Period," which repeals the effect of Estonian SSR Criminal Code articles providing for liability as a result of citizens evading conscription for military service or mobilization call-up. Enterprises and organizations on the Estonian SSR's territory have been instructed to suspend implementation of the USSR Law "On Universal Military Service."

By way of playing up to informal organizations which have sharply galvanized their activity, the Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet session adopted 3 May a resolution on the temporary suspension of young people's conscription until a solution is found to the question of all draftees performing their service on Armenian territory. This resolution was broadcast by republican television 11 May, it was published by republican newspapers 12 May, and was immediately obeyed by all organs of power. Consequently, the work of draft commissions and the dispatch of teams were totally wrecked.

All possible means, including deceit and fabrication, are used to attain the goals of this boycott of the latest draft. For example, physicians in the Lithuanian SSR are instructed to admit draftees to hospitals under the pretext of medical treatment, while VUZ [higher education establishment] administrations are authorized to register for full-time studies any part-time students who have reached the age when they should be drafted into the Army. The authors and executors of these recommendations must know that, by means of such actions, they make the teenagers accomplices to immoral actions and direct breaches of the law.

An unconcealed desire to set the population against the Armed Forces and to create in the public consciousness an image of the Army as an internal enemy and to neutralize it as a real force can be discerned in the practice of a number of informal organizations. To this end various items are published in the press denigrating servicemen and the Armed Forces as a whole and attempts are made to implant the conviction that the Soviet Army is an army of occupiers and that service in it is illegal. Persistent attempts are made to demoralize the officer corps of the military commissariats and military units. Difficulties in daily life are artificially created for officers' families and discriminatory restrictions are introduced in the exchange of coupons for food and industrial goods, in registration for housing that has already been allocated, in medical services, and in the provision of employment. Inflammatory calls for a clash with the military are heard at meetings. And as we know from the events in Armenia, these calls are followed by direct armed actions against the Army and internal troops, which often lead to a tragic outcome.

Organizations like "Geneva-49," which has departments in all the Baltic republics, the "League of Citizens of Georgia," the "Fiery Cross" (Lithuanian SSR), and some informal Armenian groups are particularly active in the anti-army campaign.

Alongside the discrediting of the Soviet Armed Forces, work has been sharply intensified recently on the creation of their own national armies. An initiative committee is operating actively in the Western oblasts of the Ukraine to organize so-called "Ukrainian Armed Forces." In the Estonian SSR detachments of the "Kaitseliit," "Kodukaitse," "Green Regiment," and "Omakaitse" are being formed which are already an organized, mobile force, which was graphically demonstrated 15 May outside Toompea palace. Similar detachments are being created in Lithuania and Latvia. It is planned that the majority of draftees "voluntarily" refusing military service will become the main reserve for manning these detachments. In Armenia matters have gotten to the point where the detachments of thugs essentially feel their are masters of the situation. They are already entering into direct armed conflicts with military subunits, as was the case 27 May, placing the whole situation in the republic on the brink of getting out of control.

If you analyze the overall dynamics of the situation, the conclusion will not be reassuring. Only 3-4 months ago the leaders of the informal organizations were using the so-called problem of the Armed Forces and young people's conscription to military service merely as a kind of demagogic ploy in the struggle for votes, for political power in the republics, and the attainment of certain concessions from the union leadership. Then there followed appeals and actions aimed at the direct nonfulfillment of USSR laws. Now the process has begun of creating national paramilitary formations as an alternative to the USSR Armed Forces and even of direct opposition to the Army and the internal troops, which fundamentally alters the situation. After all, understandably, alternatives and opposition on the basis of military structures is something different from alternative elections to the soviets of people's deputies.

There is no doubt that everything enumerated should be viewed as gross illegal actions for which there can be no justification. But today they are a reality for Armenia, the Baltic republics, and some regions of the West Ukraine and Georgia. And that is also a distinguishing feature of the 1990 spring draft.

Unfortunately, in the situation which has been created, when the informal organizations are frankly washing out of young people concepts like motherland, patriotism, duty, and responsibility, many party committees, the All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League [Komsomol], and educational establishments are demonstrating their total inability to struggle for the rising generation or to form the necessary civic principles in it.

The position of th local law enforcement organs is powerless. Unable to resist the informal organizations, they often abandon preventive work and the bringing of criminal charges. The principle of the inevitability of punishment for violating the law, a most important one for the rule-of-law state, is in fact not in operation.

The influential organ of our supreme power that is the constitutional oversight committee obviously underestimates the complexity of the situation surrounding the Armed Forces in a number of regions and in particular in connection with the latest draft of citizens to military service. Yet there is a well coordinated violation of the country's Fundamental Law with regard to one of its most fundamental avenues.

Recently there has been a frank and honest talk in the Armed Forces about existing shortcomings and internal problems. To eliminate them completely we are glad of any aid, ready to understand and accept constructive criticism on any question. Everything taking place in society is reflected in the Army. That is why methods of getting out of critical situations should be common and coordinated.

But everything must be done by democratic, legal means within the framework of existing laws. The orgy around the latest draft of citizens to active military service undoubtedly does not promote the consistent progressive changes either in the Armed Forces or in the country as a whole. Its organizers are misleading the draftees and their parents by facing them with difficult problems in the immediate future and are purposefully leading matters toward the breakdown of the process of renewal in our society.

The spring draft is continuing right now. It is not too late for young men of draft age and their parents to realize the criminal nature of the informal organizations' slogans and the falsity of many stories about military service and to act strictly in accordance with the law's demands.

Zaykov Addresses Western Group of Forces

PM0806105190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 8 Jun 90 First Edition p 2

[Report by correspondents Colonel A. Vasilets and Lieutenant Colonel I. Kosenko: "Deepening Perestroyka by Deeds. From the Western Group of Forces Party Conference"]

[Text] "Today it is more important than ever for us communists to realize the main point: The party's prestige, the staunchness of its ranks, ideological cohesion, the present, and the future are entirely dependent on each and every one of us, on our actual deeds and behavior. Today we all must pass a most earnest and most responsible test of the extent to which each and every one of us is a true communist...."

These words are from the speech by Colonel V. Trofimov. They reflect perhaps most graphically the essence and overall tone of the major and demanding discussion which took place at the Western Group of Forces party conference. The report by Colonel General A. Kolinichenko, member of the Military Council and chief of the Political Directorate, and the speeches by Army General B. Snetkov, commander in chief of the Western Group of Forces, Major General G. Kolyshkin, Colonel Yu. Ivanushkin, Lieutenant Colonel L. Shtayda, Senior Ensign L. Shumeyko, Senior Sergeant N. Sakhatskiy, and many other communists conveyed shared concern about the crisis phenomena applying the brakes on perestroyka in the country, the situation within the party, and the diverse processes occurring in the political life of East European countries. All these factors have a major effect on the life and activity of party organizations in Western Group of Forces units and subunits.

Special attention was given to problems of boosting party influence on the solution of key tasks of troops training with due consideration for the demands of the defensive military doctrine. A sharp debate developed on questions associated with military reform. Conference delegates spoke with anguish about the inadequate social protection of servicemen and members of their families and the problems looming in connection with possible cutbacks in the group of forces. It was noted that the easing of tension and the decline of the military threat do not yet mean that the military danger has been eliminated. It is impossible not to see that the opposite side retains men, equipment, and weapons for the waging of war on their former scale.

Conference delegates emphasized that, despite the numerous positive changes, the processes of renewal lag behind the demands of life and military practice. The main reason is a leaning toward the administrative style of work instead of a sharp turnabout in the direction of political methods of party leadership. This cannot be tolerated.

L. Zaykov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, took part in the conference's work and delivered a speech.

At present, he said specifically, the Western Group of Forces is the largest in numbers and the mightiest in composition and arms among all the groups of our forces abroad, in direct contact with NATO's main strike forces on the European continent. This is why such high demands are made as regards its combat readiness. Having seen for myself the life and combat training of

units and combined units—this time I had an opportunity to visit many regiments and battalions and to frankly converse with soldiers, ensigns, and officers—I am in a position to draw the following conclusion: Basically, the troops are supplied with everything they need to successfully perform the tasks assigned to them. In the complex situation prevailing as a result of the process of the two German states' unification, the personnel are fittingly performing their military duty beyond the motherland's border.

Evidence of this is provided by the results of final inspections during the 1989 academic year. It is noteworthy that not a single unit, not a single battalion received unsatisfactory marks. In the course of exercises, almost 60 percent of soldiers' collectives achieved good or excellent results. The winter training period also ended quite well. There have been positive changes in the work to strengthen military discipline.

At the same time, substantial shortcomings exist in questions concerning the improvement of combat readiness and of combat and political training in the group. They are mainly due to inefficient work on the perestroyka of the work style of military cadres who at times lack businesslike efficiency, specificity, responsibility, and profound awareness of the new circumstances stemming from political processes in East European countries. It is necessary to boost efforts as regards the radical improvement of discipline and the accident-free use of equipment, to overcome breaches of the law. Problems of interethnic relations within soldiers' collectives demand the most thorough attention.

L. Zaykov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, then dwelt on problem which are now becoming especially acute for Western Group of Forces servicemen and their families. All these problems are in one way or another associated with political processes within the framework of the two German states' unification. Many unforeseen circumstances develop, both political and economic, and they have an effect on the living conditions, daily life, and moods of servicemen and their families, giving rise to alarm and uncertainty in the future.

The speaker described the measures which are being and will be taken to overcome such moods. He emphasized that the party Central Committee has prepared a report summing up all the issues and suggestions raised by Western Group of Forces communists during the report and election campaign. Matters that should be dealt with by the Defense Ministry, the Foreign Ministry, and other departments have been passed on to the USSR Council of Ministers for the adoption of appropriate decisions. Much in this regard can and must be done by commanders, political organs, and party organizations at local level.

Comrade L. Zaykov then dwelt on fundamental questions regarding the policy of revolutionary renewal in the country. It was noted that perestroyka processes are progressing in a contradictory manner, often painfully, and affect the interests of many social strata. This demands consideration and deliberation of every practical step concerning aspects of domestic policy, the economy, and society's social and spiritual life. It is no secret that people who benefited from the situation in the past are saying: Nothing should be changed. There are also others who want to achieve everything by means of a hasty cavalry raid. They fail to comprehend that this can not only be fatal for our country but can also gravely damage the positive processes in the world, in view of the responsibility we bear in world affairs.

It was noted at the conference that, having embarked on perestroyka inside the country, we have also taken a fresh look at the world. The interdependence of political and economic processes under way in the country and foreign policy processes has been recognized, the priority of universal human values has been affirmed, a concept of reasonable sufficiency of military might at lower parity conditions has been proclaimed.

Looking into the future, the Soviet Union intends to firmly and consistently build its foreign policy along the tracks of new thinking. The new thinking determined the policy of attaining security through the reduction of confrontation by political methods. By proclaiming a new military doctrine in 1987, we invited other countries to change their attitude toward questions of war and peace, and mainly to agree to reduce the level of confrontation. A firm policy of negotiations was adopted.

Major changes have occurred in the world as a result of our perestroyka, the speaker noted. The world has perceived and largely accepted the constructive orientation of the new political thinking. Vivid proof of this is provided by M.S. Gorbachev's talks with President Bush, which ensured arrival at major accords and agreements.

Much attention in Comrade L. Zaykov's speech was devoted to an analysis of military-political problems associated with ensuring the country's defense capability and the combat readiness of USSR Armed Forces.

When it comes to the question of the two German states' unification, Comrade L. Zaykov said, one point must be clear. The Soviet Union, which bore the brunt of the last war and secured victory over fascist Germany, will never consent to any conditions or concessions which could lead to revanche.

The Soviet Union is prepared to withdraw its troops from the GDR provided a balance of forces is preserved at lower levels, ensuring security for European countries, especially in central Europe. Accord was reached with the United States in Ottawa to limit the numerical strength of USSR and U.S. troops in central Europe to 195,000 men. But come what may, the speaker said in conclusion, the Western Group of Forces must maintain its combat readiness and be vigilant.

The problems of further enhancing the party's role and prestige in the country and the Armed Forces were actively discussed at the conference.

What should the renewed CPSU be like in the conditions of political pluralism? How to overcome the crisis phenomena, boost its prestige in society, breathe a fresh breath of democratism in its structures, and make its structures receptive to all that is new and progressive? In essence, the discussion of the draft CPSU Central Committee platform and the draft new party statute at the conference boiled down to a collective quest for answers to these burning questions, which have been posed by perestroyka itself. It was noted at the conference that communists in the group firmly support the party's perestroyka policy, basically approve the drafts of the Central Committee platform and the CPSU Statute, and advocate consolidation of all of society's healthy forces in the struggle for the socialist choice, for a renewed Soviet Federation, for a transformed Marxist-Leninist party. An open letter to the CPSU Central Committee and the country's communists was also approved.

Conference participants raised the question of the 28th CPSU Congress examining and adopting a resolution on the party's military policy, in which they would like to see an objective analysis of the contemporary military-political situation in the world, political appraisals of the processes under way in East European countries and their armies, prognosis of the Warsaw Pact's future, and a clearly defined status of the USSR Armed Forces with due consideration for the new military doctrine, the prospects of military reform, and the party's program for social protection of servicemen and their families.

The conference participants elected delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress and a newly composed party commission under the Western Group of Forces Political Directorate.

The following took part in the party conference's work: Army General A. Lizichev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate; Army General S. Postnikov; and A. Soshnikov, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee State and Legal Department.

General Staff Academy Holds Roundtable on Reform

90UM0628A Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 27 May 90 First Edition p 2

[Report by KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent Lt. Col. O. Vladykin "Across the Spectrum of Opinions—Military Reform: 'Roundtable' at the General Staff Academy"]

[Text] **The reorganization taking place in the Army and Navy requires a breakthrough in military science. This thought was expressed by almost all of the participants of a "roundtable" conducted by the editorial board of KRASNAYA ZVEZDA at the USSR Armed Forces General Staff Academy. The following express their views on means, methods, and goals for implementing military reform: Vice Admiral Rudolf Aleksandrovich Golosov, head of a department; Major General Ignat Semenovich Danilenko, doctor of philosophy; Major General Slipchenko, head of a scientific research department and doctor of military sciences; Major General German Vasilyevich Kirilenko, senior instructor and doctor of military sciences; Major General Vladimir Mikhaylovich Ivanov, candidate of military sciences; Colonel Oleg Alekseyevich Belkov, doctor of philosophy; Colonel Valeriy Nikolayevich Ochirov, USSR people's deputy; and Lieutenant General Viktor Vasilyevich Solovyev, retired, doctor of military sciences.**

The participants of the "roundtable" especially emphasized the thought that the process of perestroyka in the Army and the Navy must not result in a reduction in the country's defense capability and a repetition of the situation which has currently arisen in the economy, where many old relations and mechanisms have been destroyed but the new ones have not yet begun to function. When deciding the question of defense such a situation is completely intolerable because it could become fatal.

[Danilenko] In many ways the discussion around military reform reflects the general process of the political struggle developing in society. The spectrum of views on reform is defined depending on the nature of those forces which have joined and are continuing to join the struggle, and on their goals. The most varied positions are clashing—those that are politically mature and those that are clearly irresponsible, professionally grounded, and emotionally amateurish, conservative, and extremist, informed and openly captious.... In this fashion, if some changes in the military sphere were introduced previously as a result of so to say a volitional decision, then under current conditions there is the danger of ending up at the other extreme—of deciding everything on the populist level. And I would not like to see the fate of reform depend only on who shows the greatest activity and knows how to package his ideas attractively rather than grounding them properly.

Lately the political situation in the world, in the states neighboring us, and inside our country has changed substantially and continues to change. What will happen to our Armed Forces under these circumstances? We need a scientifically based prediction. What kind of foreign policy and domestic situation will we encounter in coming years and the more distant future? What is the probability of recurrences of a policy of force and of military and political ventures? How will the political organization of Soviet society change after the conclusion of a new Union treaty and with the development of a multiparty system?

Production relations in the country are being fundamentally reorganized. And the system of economic supply for defense construction is being improved accordingly. In a word, a whole new military-economic situation is arising. The social aspect is extremely important as well. Who should serve and how many? How do we maintain the prestige of military service and work in the armed

forces? How do we provide a firmly guaranteed social support system for servicemen?...

This is far from a complete list of questions. In order to examine everything thoroughly and design a genuinely constructive program for reorganization, a high degree of competency is needed. But for some reason the professionals are keeping quiet most of the time and preferring not to involve themselves in the discussion around military reform.

[Solovyev] In my opinion this remark is just. Some people are increasingly urging public opinion to doubt the ability of the Armed Forces to properly defend the country if needed. Against the background of the silence of the specialists premature drafts for modernizing the Army and the Navy are being proposed. For instance, it is being proposed that their structures be fundamentally changed. Let us suppose this happens. But such a serious proposal should be based upon something. The strategic goals of the state. The tasks in front of the Armed Forces.... And who do they have in mind for a probable opponent, and how powerful is he? Judging by several articles in the press, their authors have not examined organizational and structural questions in this light.

[Kirilenko] First we should examine whether military reform is needed at all. If one takes the view that "the Red Army is the strongest from the taiga to the English Channel," then why change anything in it? However this is probably not true. And what then?

Usually there are some causes that give rise to military reform. For example, a change in the social and state order. New political tasks for the state. A change in economic relations in society. A leap by production to a qualitatively new level and, in connection with this, the appearance of improved types of equipment and arms....

Some very serious defects in the activities and organization of the Army and the Navy are apparently urging on a deep reorganization of those bodies as well. In particular, one often hears people saying that the military always prepares for the last war. And the accusation is not unfounded. It is very difficult for us to abandon approaches which guaranteed success in past times.

For instance the Americans considered the creation of an almost three million-strong military of professional servicemen the most acceptable means of resolving defense tasks under new conditions. And they themselves affirm that as regards training, one paid soldier is worth three American conscripts. That means that the professional can be compared, in a simplified fashion of course, with about nine million common conscripts. And this number should be doubled again if you take into account about three million people making up today's U.S. reserves of former professionals.

Undoubtedly an increase in the quality of training of Navy and Army personnel has fundamental significance for us today as well. Perhaps at the beginning we can make all sergeants and technical specialists professional along with officers and warrant officers. Depending on the complexity and importance of their duties. For the time being the rest of the soldiers can be trained from conscripts. But the Navy, the Strategic Missile Forces, aviation, and Air Defense Forces should be recruited either completely or nearly completely on a professional basis.

True, I could be asked where I will get the money for this. One of the ways is to finally introduce alternative service for those who cannot fulfill or have avoided military service. They are put to work on difficult projects, but instead of the usual tax, a 40 percent tax is taken from their wages.... And there is your money.

[Belkov] Like an incantation we repeat again and again that universal military duty is for us the only means of providing for the country's defense capability. But is it universal? Not every body of persons subject to military conscription is called to serve in the Armed Forces. And is it military? This is also a question inasmuch as many of those called up are sent to construction units, have no weapon, are not trained for the military, and do not even consider themselves soldiers. And in general, is this a duty? Thousands of young people have already avoided military service, but criminal action has only been taken against a few individuals, and they often receive a suspended sentence. So if we currently do not have universal military duty, we should either ensure that it really is achieved or we should legalize other means of staffing the military.

We know of one group which has formed around several military people's deputies, and we are aware of its makeup and its approaches to military reform. I have serious objections, for instance, to many of the positions of this group. And I am prepared to state them publicly. But now I would like to focus your attention on the work of another group.

We have been informed that a special commission has been formed to develop a concept for reform. But it is a little secretive: The public as a whole does not know what it is actually working on, what directions it is taking, and what it sees as the essence of the reorganization. Therefore we can neither praise it or criticize it. I believe that today neither the propaganda spread by some of the mass media concerning premature, frivolous positions nor silence concerning some deep conclusion are acceptable.

In this regard it seems to me that our academy, which concentrates great scientific potential and varied practical experience in itself, should not stay aloof but should begin developing its own draft for military reform.

[Ochirov] I will not deny that much may be disputed in the position of the military people's deputies who tried to work out their own concept of military reform. But let us admit that this attempt was the incentive for the broader discussion of the problems of reorganization in the military. As for which direction to take the matter, theoreticians should of course decide this along with

practical people. Just so long as it is not postponed to the indeterminate future. For instance, the question of the long-term prospects of the Army's political organs. What role should they play and what status should they have under conditions of the multiparty system forming in the country? Indeed, they developed to fulfill their functions within the framework of a single-party system and to this day they are oriented toward this end.

We cannot depoliticize the Armed Forces. Any military always finds itself under the direct political influence of the power which is established in the state. But in our country there is a contradiction emerging between the changing social relations and the arrangement of political forces on one side and the character and forms of political work in the military on the other. But the military scholars are all remaining silent and not proposing ways of resolving this problem. That same draft of reforms which was proposed by the deputies has many weak points for the very reason that very few genuinely qualified specialist were drawn into its work.

[Golosov] In my opinion, the most important question of reform—its methodology—is still outside our field of vision. Without a systematic approach to constructing the armed forces, one will not attain the expected effect from reorganization.

I will cite the experience of the Navy, which is closest to me. For a long time the emphasis in its development was put on assault structures. We believed that the greater the number of powerful ships with powerful weapons we had, the better it was for combat readiness. And what happened as a result?

For instance we have the largest number of submarines of any fleet in the world. But we are far from being able to launch them into the sea at a given moment. It is because the supply and repair capabilities of our fleet are extremely weak. One may ask what the sense of an increase in the number of submarines is if we cannot fully use them.

When working out a concept of military reform it is apparently necessary to think about the balanced development of the full structure of the Armed Forces—from the assault subsystems to the network of roads and the number of warehouses, stores, kindergartens, etc. The practice of economizing in the sphere which provides for the vital functions of the Army and Navy is costing us very dearly.

A young lieutenant comes to the fleet and wanders around the city looking for a roof for his wife and child, and he is told "In a week you are going on float for six months." One can hardly expect the normal fulfillment of his duties at sea from an officer who has little experience and in addition is overwhelmed with housing problems. And the sailors subordinate to him can hardly do basic arithmetic and can only understand Russian with difficulty. And this is the kind of output we continually get with our system of complex, high-priced equipment.

[Kirilenko] Within the context of this problem there is also the question of the geography of our garrisons. The way they are situated is an obvious anachronism. There exist an enormous number of unpromising military installations which arose in the days of the cavalry in utterly forgotten places. At one time they were situated according to the need to cover practically the entire expanse of our borders, difficulties with transport, and the concentration of forces in various directions in the event that a military threat should arise.

Now the mobility of the troops is many times higher, and the political situation around our country has changed completely. And the old garrisons continue to exist, having lost their former significance on the one hand and adversely affecting military performance and creating a mass of difficulties for their supply on the other.

In my opinion it would be advisable in the course of military reform to create large military centers on the basis of large garrisons already existing in various regions of the country. In modern times this will in no way reduce the state's defense capacity, and it will permit us to resolve a number of other problems. And in the long run it will significantly reduce the economic costs of maintaining the military installations.

[Ivanov] We constantly hear talk about the need to change the structure of the Armed Forces. And that is not accidental. The structure really is outdated—it is unwieldy and difficult to administer. For example, take the example of the administrative organs [glavkomaty] under the commanders in chief of the branches of the Armed Forces. Perhaps under current conditions it would be possible to replace them with small administrative formations. For example with committees which would occupy themselves exclusively with the implementation of the technological side of military doctrine. And have a single strategic system for general administration of defense activity.

Let us suppose that in this structure we could have strategic forces which include troops equipped with the most technically advanced and powerful weapons. They would be staffed completely on a voluntary basis.

The second echelon would be readiness forces which could include combined units and units of all the present branches of the Armed Forces, also staffed by contract forces.

In addition there would be general forces which in peacetime would be maintained at a reduced level and would be mobilized, drawing on the reserves, only when military danger arises.

And training forces make up the reserves. All the bodies of people that are considered subject to conscription today will go through military training.

And the last echelon would be the organs of local military administration selecting the candidates for contract service, registering the mobile resources, and administering the pension system for former servicemen.

[Slipchenko] As we see, we have already proposed many ideas here worthy of attention. But who should accumulate, analyze, and objectively evaluate them? It happens that military science is in the position of a stepchild with regard to the country's leading scientific organization. And that despite its clear demarcations. It exists objectively and takes in several dozen specialists upon whom, incidentally, are conferred scholarly titles.

Academic science believes that military problems encompass many sciences, and this is supposedly enough for them to refuse to grant military science equal rights. We have academies of medical, pedagogical, and agricultural sciences and an Academy of Art.... But there is not even a military department in the overall academic establishment. As a result military scholars cannot use the scientific potential of the state to full measure. Developing only within the framework of the Ministry of Defense, military science often provides a basis for decisions that have already been made. There is no mechanism for realizing scientific positions. A paradoxical situation takes place: It is as if no one in the country is occupied with the study of issues of conducting an armed struggle.

I am convinced that we must immediately create an academy of military sciences or even a department under the USSR Academy of Sciences if we are to seriously conduct military reforms and develop a genuinely scientific concept. This standing organ should consist of military scholars and have academic VUZ's [higher educational institutions], institutes, and scientific centers in its organizational makeup. If we take this route, then not only the current reform but all reorganizations to follow—and of course they are unavoidable in the military sphere in the future as well—will be carried out in a qualitative and, most importantly, in a timely fashion.

[Belkov] But we military people should not aspire to a monopoly when working out a plan for reform. All the levels of our society have their own interest in it. I am convinced that a commission studying reform must necessarily include representatives of various departments, national and regional structures, and age groups. The latter pertains to the military most of all. One understands that a lieutenant cannot command a division and that it is difficult for a colonel to figure out the tasks for a troop commander of a military district or the commander in chief of a branch of the armed forces. But this logic also has its reverse side. Few marshals can present in detail the needs and problems of a modern regiment, and few colonels understand the concerns of modern lieutenants. If we want the reform to be all-embracing and effective then the marshal, the colonel, and the lieutenant should all be involved in designing it.

Baltic Republics

Brazauskas, Prunskiene Interviewed on Moscow Visit

LD1106151190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1300 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Telephone interview with Algirdas Brazauskas, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party, and Premier Kazimierz Prunskiene by correspondent Benas Rupeika in Moscow 11 June—live or recorded]

[Text] [Rupeika] I have already mentioned that Algirdas Brazauskas and K. Prunskiene landed safely in Moscow after a three-four hour flight. Negotiations with N. Ryzhkov might be starting. However, I think you will find our telephone conversation more interesting. So, here, K. Prunskiene and Algirdas Brazauskas from Moscow.

Probably what you can report at the moment is only that you are in Moscow.

[Brazauskas] That's right, we are in Moscow, we are trying to organize things. A large meeting is taking place at the moment. So far we have not managed to talk to esteemed Nikolay Ryzhkov. I think we probably will agree today; probably the meeting will take place.

[Rupeika] Was the invitation from N. Ryzhkov?

[Brazauskas] Well, this is our joint initiative. A letter from the Council of Ministers with the decision adopted by us concerning the actions attached to the letter...

[Rupeika] Was this the decision of the government?

[Brazauskas] Yes, that's right, the government's decision. So, everything is taking place on the government line. Naturally, the main issue is the blockade. We must speak about it in concrete terms. I cannot hear you very well because there are many people around here and they are making a noise. I find it difficult to speak.

[Rupeika] Will Ryzhkov be able to play a full part in the talks since his accident?

[Brazauskas] Of course he will; he is working normally, so I do not see why he should not be able to be a full partner. I have no doubts he will be able to participate.

[Rupeika] One can speak about hopes much and in non-specific terms? Would you like to do this?

[Brazauskas] You know I like to talk in specific terms. What sort of predictions should I make here and later comment on, when there are no specific agreements or decisions? When these are made, then we can speak about them without reservations.

[Rupeika] And what is the prime minister doing at the moment?

[Brazauskas] The prime minister is standing here, next to me.

[Rupeika] Hello, prime minister, I hope I am not disturbing you too much.

[Prunskiene] Not at all. We have a three-hour break.

[Rupeika] A. Brazauskas made an introduction, could you carry on telling us what else you managed to achieve?

[Prunskiene] Do you mean what we have managed to do since we had arrived? Only to find out what is going on here in Moscow, what the president and prime minister are engaged in. We know our meeting will take place in the evening only because several events are taking place at the same time and they have to participate in them.

[Rupeika] You just mentioned the word "president". Is there any hope Gorbachev will see you?"

[Prunskiene] We do not know for sure, although such thoughts were voiced during the conversation last week with Prime Minister Ryzhkov.

[Rupeika] A. Brazauskas did not answer my question concerning hopes. What about you?

[Prunskiene] As you know, I always am full of hopes. However, how realistic all these hopes are will become clear after our talks. No doubt, if the meeting takes place, this will not be a meeting just for meeting's sake. The objective of this meeting should not be this. It is clear we shall discuss very specific things and no doubt, the first item on our part is the future of our young men, guarantees and assurances, and then the blockade.

[Rupeika] Nevertheless, this trip perhaps is the most serious step taken on both sides by Moscow and Vilnius.

[Prunskiene] It is difficult to say at the moment which step is the most serious, which is the most fatal move and what the next steps will be when we even do not know the exact agenda of the participants of our meeting today. Yet there is no doubt that at this stage, this is what we have been expecting, and this is a necessary thing and I do not think both sides would senselessly waste time in this case when the situation is tense both in Lithuania and the Soviet Union."

[Rupeika] Best of luck to you, all Lithuania is with you.

[Prunskiene] Thank you.

Ryzhkov Meeting Postponed

LD1206083990 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 0000 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Text] Lithuanian Prime Minister K. Prunskiene and Deputy Prime Minister A. Brazauskas expected to meet with USSR Prime Minister Ryzkhov yesterday [11 June]. However, in the evening the news reached us that the meeting did not take place; it had been postponed until tomorrow.

We learned from unofficial sources that the Lithuanian representatives will also be received by Mikhail Gorbachev.

A joint session of the leadership of the Lithuanian Supreme Council and the government took place today. Participants in the session exchanged information about activities for the immediate future. They also spoke about the coordination of work; the commemoration of tragic dates for Lithuania were also discussed.

Landsbergis Addresses People of Lithuania

LD1206104990

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 0828 GMT on 12 June broadcasts a repeat of a 10-minute speech by Lithuanian President Vytautas Landsbergis to the people of Lithuania said to have been first broadcast on Lithuanian radio on 11 June. Landsbergis begins his speech by detailing the events scheduled for 14 June, the Day of Sorrow and Hope, commemorating the deportations after the Stalinist invasion and occupation of Lithuania in 1940. Landsbergis says this year the day will be marked not only as a day of sorrow and hope but also as a day of determination. He goes on to say: "15 June follows. This is the day when 50 years ago foreign troops crossed the border of Lithuania and took the state independence from sovereign Lithuania.

"On this day our Supreme Council will have an extraordinary session to commemorate this day, not solemnly, but with great importance, for this evil day has great significance in our history."

Landsbergis goes on to say guests from various republics of the USSR will be invited. Speaking about visitors from the West he says that many of the guests invited by Lithuania have not been allowed in by the Soviet authorities. He continues:

"This is because other people decide for us whether or not visas should be granted, whether or not international banking operations should be allowed, whether or not all the exits into the world should be completely closed, or perhaps some little gap should be left open."

Landsbergis then turns to the subject of goods and commodities being detained on the other side of the Lithuanian border by Soviet officials, goods which Lithuania purchased with its own money. He says that this action by the Soviet Union has caused it to lose so much in the eyes of other states of the world. He says: "This should come to an end, the more so because changes are coming to this part of the world, to our neighboring countries. Russia itself is also undergoing changes. We can see how Russian democratic forces speak out and demand with increasing force that Russia should be given its rights, its sovereignty."

Landsbergis goes on to speak in greater detail about what these demands are. Comparing them with the demands of Lithuania, Landsbergis says:

"A year ago we spoke about sovereignty, we adopted a declaration and amendements to the constitution, just as the deputies at the Russian congress are doing at the moment. We were the first—or almost the first because the same ideas were declared before us by the Estonian parliament. Together with Estonia we were the first and therefore we were scolded for being bad and now we are being reprimanded and punished. And so, is Russia also naughty? Is Russia also proceeding along the wrong path, as we are sometimes told: You are going backwards. No, neither we nor Russia are going backward, but forward to a more just life and a more just order."

Landsbergis assures the people that the blockade will be overcome. Speaking about recent developments, Landsbergis says: "Currently, important conferences are taking place in Moscow. Ceslovas Stankevicius, deputy chairman of the Supreme Council, returned from consultations on political and legal matters concerning the ways of solving our problems. Today, our prime minister and deputy prime minister flew to Moscow hoping to see the USSR prime minister. This failed to materialize, however, although it appears that an important meeting will take place tomorrow. A meeting of the chairmen of the Supreme Councils of the three Baltic countries with President Gorbachev is to take place tomorrow. Today I had a meeting with Gorbunovs, chairman of the Latvian Supreme Council, in Panevezys. We met to discuss tomorrow's trip. Following this, I had several telephone conversations with Ryuytel, chairman of the Estonian Supreme Council, and we will meet tomorrow in Moscow. Hopefully, the points we agreed on will take place. Maybe K. Prunskiene and Algirdas Brazauskas will also take part in the meeting. In brief, things are moving!" Landsbergis states that this must happen because the situation which had been unjustly created could not remain like this for ever.

In conclusion, Landsbergis says that if the dialogue, or negotiations, do begin they cannot proceed under conditions of blockade. He expresses hope that some good news will come on 14 or 15 June if the negotiations begin.

Landsbergis Considers Lithuania in Warsaw Pact

90UN2054A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 23, 9-15 Jun 90 p 6

[INTERFAX report: "Is There a Way Out of the Crisis? Accommodating Move?"]

[Text] A seminar for Soviet journalists organized by the independent Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee and the republic Journalists Union has been conducted in Vilnius. A press conference for the participants in the seminar was given by Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of Lithuanian Supreme Council. We offer for your attention extracts from it.

[Question] How would you comment on the results of the meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and four members of the Supreme Council?

[Landsbergis] This was a kind of estimate of the possible direction of further discussions with Moscow.

[Question] And could you not provide such an estimate?

[Landsbergis] You are aware of the initiative of French President Mitterrand and FRG Chancellor Kohl—this was a proposal that negotiations with the USSR be sought on the path of a suspension of the 11 March enactments. This is, in my opinion, a boundary at which it is possible to talk.

But President Gorbachev wants to pull us beneath this boundary. It is essentially a question of the suspension or freezing of the provisional Constitution of independent Lithuania which is currently in force. And for what reason? So that Lithuania obediently return to the cage, and then discussions with it will begin. But abandoning independence voluntarily now, after it was taken away by force 50 years ago, would mean putting ourselves in a worse legal position than before.

[Question] You are being criticized for the tactics of achieving Lithuania's independence for which you have opted. What is your attitude toward this?

[Landsbergis] Well, criticism is useful.

[Question] What is your attitude toward the idea of Leningrad's association with a Baltic market? Such an intention has been voiced by A. Sobchak, the new chairman of the Leningrad City Soviet.

[Landsbergis] In our situation, when the word "blockade" is most comprehensible to Leningraders, we are indeed aware of the moral and political support and appreciate specific cooperation proposals. I know that a plenipotentiary delegation of ours is expected in Leningrad.

The blockade of Lithuania can only be broken by both sides. And if our friends in Russia really set about this, the blockade will most certainly be broken.

[Question] How do you conceive of the possible status of Soviet forces in an independent Lithuania?

[Landsbergis] We anticipate that this question, as others also, will be resolved by way of negotiations with the Soviet Union. There is the idea of a return to the 1939 treaty, in accordance with which Red Army bases were deployed on Lithuanian territory. Under present conditions this is a not very attractive, but permissible, solution, the more so in that a defined framework—quantitative and qualitative—would be established in accordance with this treaty. Of course, no country would welcome nuclear or chemical weapons on its territory. Precisely which bases to make available and for what period of time could be determined.

Another possibility is that of the Warsaw Pact and independent Lithuania as a participant in it. In the event of our joining the Warsaw Pact, the opponents of Lithuanian independence would be deprived of the argument that Lithuania leaves some gap in the strategic system of equilibrium in Europe.

[Question] Sanctions against Lithuania on the part of the USSR continue. The first deputy economics minister has announced that in the next few days the number of unemployed in Lithuania could reach 100,000. What then?

[Landsbergis] For the leaders who have resolved to employ such a weapon against Lithuania as economic warfare the obvious calculation is: Mass unemployment will give rise to discontent among the people, which could shift the blame, that is direct it not against those who have imposed the blockade but against those who are attempting in every way possible to find methods of counteracting it and helping the inhabitants of the republic.

The increase in unemployment could, perhaps, overtake our efforts to create new jobs and furnish the enterprises with other sources of raw material and resources. Then there would really be a political question. This also is the hope of the ultimatums being given our government and parliament.

I would like to mention that the USSR is heterogeneous also. There is a leadership which has imposed the blockade, and there are other political forces which condemn such actions.

It is difficult to predict the depth of the political crisis which could ensue in Lithuania and what this could bring about in the Soviet Union itself. I believe that the USSR Government also would be taking a risk, even in the event of the suppression of Lithuania. This would hardly be a victory. Even, ultimately, given great pressure on the Lithuanian Supreme Council for it to reverse the declaration on independence, it could not do so since it does not have a mandate for such a decision.

Lithuanian Official Views Disastrous Blockade

AU0906123090 Paris AFP in English 2214 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Excerpt] Copenhagen, June 8 (AFP)—The continuing economic blockade imposed by the Soviet authorities on Lithuania has brought the tiny Baltic republic "to the brink of disaster," Lithuanian Foreign Minister Algirdas Saudargas said here Friday.

Mr. Saudargas, speaking after a meeting with officials of Estonia and Latvia on the sidelines of a European security conference here, said the blockade represented "economic war by a big nation against a small country." The Soviet authorities imposed a blockade on Lithuania after the republic made a unilateral declaration of independence from the Soviet Union on March 11.

The Lithuanian official said the republic was suffering shortages of medicines, fuel and food, and was suffering

massive unemployment and considerable financial losses because of the blockade. Mr. Saudargas said some 65,800 people had been laid off because of the lack of fuel and raw materials to work their factories. He added that since the blockade started on April 16, only 16 per cent of the normal supplies of Soviet natural gas had reached Lithuania, and petrol and diesel fuel stocks would run out between June 15 and June 20 unless new supplies were received.

He also said that the central Soviet authorities had refused a total of 227 requests for visas from foreigners seeking to visit Lithuania between April 17 and May 28.

Mr. Saudargas spoke in the company of top officials from Estonia and Latvia, the two other Baltic states whose nationalist administrations are seeking independence from the Soviet Union. The three states were annexed by Stalin's regime in 1940 under the terms of the Soviet-Nazi pact signed the previous year. The Baltic officials were in Copenhagen to press their countries' causes before the 35-nation Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

Earlier the three republics said they had officially demanded to be given observer status at the CSCE, which currently includes all sovereign European states except Albania, plus Canada and the United States, at an upcoming conference in Paris. Latvian Foreign Minister Janis Jurkans said a letter containing the joint application would be sent to all CSCE member nations. [passage omitted]

'Adequate Supplies' in Vilnius Despite Blockade

PM1106160790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 10 Jun 90 First Edition p 5

[Captain Second Class V. Gromak report: "Lithuania: 'We Should Be So Lucky To Have a Blockade Like That...'"]

[Text] "Blockade" is the most commonly heard word in Lithuania today. It is being discussed at sessions of the Lithuanian parliament, in the squares, on the trolleybuses, at the newspaper stands.

Somebody who had never been to Vilnius and who had listened to all kinds of "voices" could get the impression that the people of Vilnius were dying of starvation. This is not my first visit to Vilnius. I was last here in late April. Little has changed in the city's appearance or in the appearance of its inhabitants during that time. The streets of the Lithuanian capital are just as full of happy and smartly dressed citizens. There are just as many cars on the road (where they get the gas from is a secret). Chicken, duck, beef, pork, kidneys, and five or six different kinds of sausages and cheeses are available. There is an adequate selection of dairy products, candy, oats, and so forth. There are also adequate supplies at manufactured goods stores—you can see things that you will never see even in Moscow.

Sergey Nikolayevich Landik, a driver on secondment to Vilnius from Kaliningrad, could only say: "We should be so lucky to have a blockade like that..."

Admittedly, residents of the Lithuanian capital are experiencing some discomfort. Television is only broadcasting between 1800 and 2400 hours. There is not always hot water in the apartments, fewer newspapers are being published, production of certain foodstuffs has been restricted, and rationing has been introduced for liquor. Filter cigarettes have disappeared from store windows. This has immediately been exploited by speculators. Packs of cigarettes are selling for R2 rubles outside the entrance to the "Vilnius" food store.

Enterprising dealers have quickly found their feet in the "blockade" and "friendship visits" to Kiev, Minsk, Leningrad, and other cities have become more frequent. Muscular guys bring back impressive caseluls of all kinds of goods to be traded. They are supplying Lithuania particularly actively with gasoline and vodka—earning a profit in the process, naturally. But the transport police are inclined to turn a blind eye to gas canisters or bottles clinking during the journey...

Lithuanian Army Deserters' Crimes Reported

PM1106093790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 9 Jun 90 First Edition p 3

[Dispatch by Captain Second Class V. Gromak: "Deserters and Crime"]

[Text] Vilnius—Blackmail, threats, acts of provocation, physical violence—that is a far from full list of the notorious methods of work of the Lithuanian nationalists with young men of draft age and their parents. In one Lithuanian military commissariat I was shown a copy of a statement which the Sajudis members present to draftees. It is addressed to A. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and contains a request to be deprived of USSR citizenship. It is thus a refusal to serve in the Soviet Army. The author of this standardized statement, so to speak, is K. Yuknyus, a former Ministry of Internal Affairs staffer and now chairman of the "Sajudis" headquarters in Shilale City. He is also the organizer of all actions to disrupt the draft in the city and actively persuades boys arriving on leave not to return to their units and then gives shelter to deserters.

It is curious that K. Yuknyus' own son is right now serving in a unit of the Baltic Military District and his father has a somewhat different approach toward him: According to Colonel K. Golubev, Yuknyus has frequently instructed his son to serve normally and not even to think of abandoning his unit.

So that's it. The fate of his own son nonetheless perturbs him, but the fate of other people's sons... At present there is a search in the republic for 556 deserters whom "Sajudis" has blessed for their "good deeds." What kind of good deeds these are is confirmed by the less than reassuring statistics for the overall rise in crime in the

republic. In the first quarter of this year alone crime rose nearly 22 percent. The number of murders has increased 58.5 percent and the number of thefts 43 percent. In Kedaynskiy Rayon two young men who were strangers to her pushed a young woman into their automobile, drove off to a collective orchard, and raped her. One of the rapists was Saulyus Saldis, who had deserted from the Soviet Army. In another rayon, Shilalskiy Rayon, a young boy, S. Bataytis, died from blows inflicted by deserter R. Krashpaltsas...

Report on 'Provocations' During Lithuanian Draft

PM0806091390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 7 Jun 90 First Edition p 3

[Dispatch by special correspondent Captain Second Rank V. Gromak: "Draft Against Background of Provocations"]

[Text] Vilnius—Here are just a few reports coming in to the Lithuanian republican commissariat. "The Shyaulyay military commissar has recently received nine anonymous threatening letters. There has been an attempt to set fire to the military commissariat building. A shot from a rocket was fired at the window of one office. A fire broke out which was successfully extinguished.

"Captain Lasis and Major Sprytsyk were subjected to insults and threats from some parents during the execution of their official duties and the presentation of summonses to predraft-age youths."

Nonetheless the attempts of the republic's reactionary forces to wreck the draft are failing. As of 1 June 1,156 men were drafted in the republic, including 400 draftees of indigenous nationality. The overwhelming majority will serve in the Baltic (636) and Moscow (520) military districts. Having received their summonses 160 men refused categorically to serve. And I am sincerely sorry for these boys who have become the victims of the present government's ambitions. The law is inexorable—sooner or later they will have to answer. Just as those who have deserted from military service will have to answer. Right now there are 556 of these men in the republic. As of today 328 men have returned to their units.

Colonel K. Golubev, chief of the republican military commissariat political department, cited the following example. A petty officer second class from the Black Sea fleet came to Klaypeda on short-term leave. The Klaypeda "Sajudis," having found out about the petty officer, decided to assume the role of "patron." But then the young man's mother appealed to the military commissariat for help.

"And we explained to her," Golubev said, "that her son had taken an oath and was criminally liable to the USSR law..."

The petty officer returned to his place of service.

"There are plenty of these examples," Konstantin Grigoryevich continues. "I know it is very hard for parents in today's situation which is heated to the limit. I am sure that the Lithuanian parliament is creating this atmosphere deliberately. And it is delivering its blow accurately. Today 38,500 young men from Lithuania are serving in the army. And having placed all these boys in the predicament of having to choose between two laws—those of the USSR and the Lithuanian republic—the Sajudis members are keeping them in a state of fear for the future."

Recently acts of provocation with regard to the draft have been becoming increasingly refined. In the Vilnius military commissariats I was shown the "summons" issued to draftees. I shall cite its text in full, retaining the style and spelling: "Esteemed Comrade A.Yu. Leolyan. As of 1 June 1990 you are exempted from military service because of the situation which has taken shape in our republic. We ask you to go to the URVD [expansion unknown] to hand in your registration certificate. At any time convenient to you. Commissar (signature), 28 May 1990."

Colonel K. Golubev gave an explanation of these forgeries in the Lithuanian Television features and news program "Mirror."

A rumor spread through the republic with lightning speed to the effect that on the first day of the school examinations the military would seize young men and send them off to the army. Parents were urged to organize a guard at schools and to prevent the kidnaping. The organizer of the story was the leader of the "League for a free Lithuania," one Terlyatskas, and the "Young Lithuania" youth organization. The rumor was successful: The telephones are constantly ringing in the military commissariats. People are telephoning from schools, the ministry of education, and the Ministry of Internal Affairs. And again Major General A. Visotskis, the republic's military commissar, in TIESA and the political department chief on republican radio are explaining that during the school leaving examinations not a single draftee will even be summoned to the military commissariat.

They had only just reassured the draftees' parents when there was a new act of provocation. Here is V. Lizenko, military commissar of Vilnius' Sovetskiy Rayon:

"On 1 June at 1900 hours a vehicle drew up at the military commissariat. Three long-haired youths and two television cameramen got out. One young man wore a military greatcoat with a backpack on his shoulders and the two others were in paramilitary uniform. They carried a banner which said in English: "The war is ended if that's what you want." They drew an antiwar sign on the asphalt. The whole act was filmed on video."

Similar actions were carried out the same day outside the building of the republican military commissariat and Vilnius rayon military commissariats.

"There is no doubt that this was a planned action," says Colonel Golubev. "The day before the republican military commissariat received a telephone call from the republic's ministry of internal affairs asking what we would do if young men broke into the military commissariats' grounds. To which the general replied: We shall act in accordance with the law, right up to the use of weapons. The militia immediately organized patrols outside all military commissariats."

That is the complex situation over the draft in Lithuania. Despite that, the commissariat workers are fulfilling their duty with a lofty sense of responsibility. After the final examination in the schools the draft of school leavers liable to the USSR Council of Ministers resolution will begin.

Supreme Council Examines Commemorative Dates

LD0906183790 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1900 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Text] A meeting of the Presidium of the Supreme Council of the republic of Lithuania was held today, chaired by Supreme Council Chairman Vytautas Landsbergis.

The meeting discussed tragic dates in Lithuania's past—the commemoration of 15 June 1940 and 14 June 1941. The presidium approved the arrangements by public organizations and the catholic church for a day of mourning and hope which this year is also a day of determination, firmness, and unity.

A meeting of the Supreme Council is to be held to mark 15 June 1940.

The presidium also examined the work of the Information Department of the Supreme Council. It instructed the Information Department to prepare a work plan, making use of the experience of the parliamentary services of foreign countries. The Foreign Affairs Commission of the Supreme Council was instructed to organize a visual information bureau.

Lithuania Issues Appeal on 'Ungrounded' Attacks

LD1006114290 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 9 Jun 90

[Text] Representatives of Lithuania's political parties and movements have issued an appeal to the people of Lithuania. The appeal expresses concern over the ever more frequently voiced ungrounded attacks against the leaders of the republic's parliament and government. It calls upon people to refrain from any dubious acts aimed against the republic's leadership or fomenting inter-party strife. At the same time it is emphasized that this does not prevent each party and its members from having their own opinion and voicing it, as well as from proposing their own versions for resolving the most important issues of present-day life in Lithuania.

Publishing House 'Attack' Under Investigation

LD0806131390 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0900 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Text] Information by the republican procuracy: On 20 April a group of servicemen attacked a workshop of the Lithuanian publishing house Spauda in Maironio Street. This incident has been investigated by the Lithuanian republican procuracy. It was established that during the attack the volunteers who were on duty there; workers of the editorial offices; journalists; a deputy of the republic of Lithuania Supreme Council, Zigmas Vaisvila; and other people were beaten up. As is known, this act of violence was carried out by soldiers of a military unit commanded by Lieutenant Colonel Fedorov.

According to the laws of the republic of Lithuania, crimes committed by the servicemen are investigated by military procuracies. Therefore, this criminal case has been handed over for further investigation to the acting military procurator of the Vilnius military garrison, Zaychenko. He, accepting the case, assured that the investigation would be carried out objectively and the culprits punished.

Commercial Weekly Published in Lithuania

LD0906050890 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1005 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Summary] Algirdas Usas reports that a new weekly LIETUVOS KOMERSANTAS [LITHUANIAN BUSINESSMAN] has been published by the National Study of Lithuanian Cooperatives. Its editor, Albertas Ruzas, stated that it should read by every family to gain knowledge about practical trade and commerce, saving and saving psychology etc. The weekly will deal with problems and interests of cooperative movement, cooperation among states, etc.

Estonian Parliament Not To Endorse Tax Law

LD1206084890 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 1700 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Summary] Today's Supreme Soviet session decided not to endorse the USSR taxation law on changing income tax for foreigners and stateless persons, and to wait until Estonian taxation law is adopted before changing anything in this field.

Estonian Labor Council Protests Nazi Rally

LD1106121990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1100 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] Tallin, 11 Jun TASS correspondent Albert Maloveryan reports:

The participants of the Estonian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] United Labor Collective Council conference lodged a protest to the republic's Supreme Soviet demanding that the rally of the so-called liberation struggle members in Estonia be prevented.

Those invited to the rally scheduled for 7-9 June are all "fellows-in-arms"—veterans of the 20th SS division formed in Estonia during the Hitlerite period of occupation—of the Estonian "Omakaytse" national self-defense batallions and other groups which took an active part in the punitive actions against the population not only in Estonia but also in the occupied territories of Russia and Belorussia.

The United Labor Collective Council comprises enterprises of mainly Russian-speaking personnel, including those from the republics and areas which still remember the hitmen of the 20th SS division which mainly consisted of recruits from among Estonian residents.

The protest sent by this organization to the Supreme Soviet of the republic assesses the intended rally as a step on the path to restoring in Estonia the spirit of fascism condemned by all mankind, and of legalizing pro-fascist organizations there.

More on Rally

LD1106211190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0945 GMT 5 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksey Yurkin]

[Text] Tallinn, 5 Jun (TASS)—A rayon council of the Estonian town of Valga has sent an ultimatum to the Baltic military district: If the tank mounted on a pedestal marking the 35th anniversary of the town's liberation from fascists is not removed by 20 June, national forces will remove it.

More than 8 thousand Soviet soldiers died in the battles for Valga, and nearly 30 thousand people perished in the town concentration camp from the hands of Estonian nationalists from the "Omakaitse" sub-unit. Estonian patriots who fought the occupants were among them, too.

...The explosion that sounded on the night of 2-3 April destroyed the monument and provoked a wave of protest throughout the country. The culprits, however, were not found at the time. Now, after the monument has been restored, the rayon council, which has been taken over by representatives of the Estonian People's Front and extremists from various nationalistic militarized formations, whose number is rapidly growing, conceived the design to eliminate it.

The Estonian-language media are openly and broadly publicizing preparations for a meeting of veterans of the 20th SS division, the "Omakaitse" batallions and "the Green Brothers" units. The hands of these troops are stained with the blood of the Russian, Belorussian, and Estonian peoples.

It is planned to hold a rally of the Estonian fascists and those who took part in reprisals and destruction in the Parnu Rayon in the Tori settlement between 7 and 9 July. It is precisely here that the fascist underlings hunted down the partisans, executed the local activists, and helped the German troops in their battles with the Parnu and Tallinn extermination battalions. The Estonian SS men took part in the punitive operations both in the Baltic republics, and in Russia and Belorussia.

It is not only the former members of the punitive detachments and the "Green Brothers" that are raising their heads. The units of "Kaytseliyt" in Estonia, numbering many thousands, have been placed under the banner of national exclusivity. These formations already have more than 40,000 members. The "Eesti Kodukaytse" units were sworn in at the town hall square, with national banners flying. The head of staff of these formations, Andrus Eevel, stated that under his command were 3 thousand "soldiers of order." They are subordinated to the National Front's security service and can, at any time, receive weapons from the stores of the republican Ministry of Internal Affairs, because "Kodukaytse" is by law subordinate to Internal Affairs Minister Olev Laanyarv.

The rapid growth of militarized formations and the active rehabilitation of the fascist stooges make one receive with incredulity Mariu Lauristin's statements at the congress of Russia's people's deputies. Far-reaching interests are to be found behind the smoothness of her expressions. Counting on "Democratic Russia's" help, the founder of the National Front and the leader of the right-wing nationalist wing of the Estonian parliament insists on direct treaties with Russia to neutralize the center and to obtain resources from Russian stores.

However, the nationalists in Valga and Tallinn have poorly learned the lessons of history. A tank can be blown up, but you cannot erase from the Estonian people's memory the heroism and the great sacrifices of the Soviet people during the liberation of the Baltic republics.

Estonian Labor Collectives Council Goals Viewed

LD1006062790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 9 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The UCLC, the United Council of Labor Collectives of Estonia, was created as an economic organization uniting the major industrial all-Union enterprises. However, the activities of the organization quickly became political as well, expressing, on the whole, the interests of Estonia's non-native population. [video shows scenes from the conference]

After the events of the 15 May in the high town [as heard], the repubic's Council of Ministers repealed the decree on the registration of organizations. So, today the UCLC is, in principle, an informal organization. What are this movement's further goals?

[V.I. Jarovoy, chairman of the UCLC, identified by screen caption] There are public organizations that have been created within the framework of the UCLC. So,

today we have a council of directors, which will busy itself with issues on its own level. A council of women has been created, an organization which exists within the framework of the UCLC. They will work among labor collectives with women. We will create, nevertheless, I think, a trade union within the framework of the UCLC, which will operate the Komsomol. So, our activities will be aimed within the UCLC at forming—well, the defense of the interests of labor collectives. Though these public organizations it will occupy itself with issues of unity, mutual understanding, and bringing information to collectives. It seems to me this year the critical moment must come, that is, probably at the end of the year, well in a year's time, and the situation must return to normal. [video shows Jarovoy being interviewed]

Estonian Parliament Views Ownership, Immigration

LD1106212590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Report by correspondent H. Lenk from the Estonian Supreme Soviet session in Tallinn; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The latest session of the Estonian Supreme Soviet opened in Tallin today.

[Lenk] Summing up the work of the first months of the permanent Estonian parliament, one can say that the entire activity of deputies is aimed at achieving the economic and political sovereignty of the republic.

Today, for example, the parliament was working on laws on immigration and ownership. The latter will open all paths; both for the development of private ownership, without which a market economy is inconceivable. Incidentally, the government of the republic has already adopted a decision permitting any citizen to open his own private shop or cafe. There are many who would like to do so.

Great hopes also are being placed in Estonia on direct economic ties with other republics and cities. The Leningrad and Moscow Soviets already have expressed an interest in direct supplies from Estonia.

Estonian Government Freezes Union Assets

LD1106163890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Excerpt] The report-back and election of the United Council of Labor Collectives of the Estonian republic has been held in Tallinn. The Estonian government is withholding official recognition from the United Council. A memorial meeting was held on 15 May by representatives of the Russian-speaking section of the population, and some of its participants attempted to penetrate the government's headquarters in order to hand a protest to the leaders of the republic. The demonstrators were protesting the restoration of certain articles in the 1938 Constitution of the republic of Estonia and the abolition of the state symbols of the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic.

This led to the following retaliatory measures. The Estonian government suspended the charter of the United Council of Estonian Labor Collectives and its bank account was frozen. This temporary measure has still not been resinded. Because of the changes which have occurred in the republic's social and political life, it has been decided to set up a state territorial interindustry association in Estonia, whose task is to establish machinery to provide social security for working people of collectives—those which belong to the association, of course. [passage omitted]

Ryuytel, Others Discuss Visit to Sweden

LD1006013590

[Editorial Report] Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian at 1830 GMT on 5 June, in its "Point of View" [Vatevinkel] program, broadcasts a 30-minute report on the recent visit to Sweden by a delegation of the Estonian Supreme Soviet. Together in the studio with program presenters Mati Talvik and Enn Leisson are Arnold Ryuytel, chairman of the Supreme Soviet, and Ants Veetouseme and Enn Poldroos, members of the Estonian Supreme Soviet Presidium.

The program begins with Ryuytel talking about the importance of the visit to Sweden. He says: "Well, I would, perhaps, emphasize in principle most of all the fact that a Supreme Soviet delegation has visited Sweden in this way and in this composition, because—as is known—on the level of power and authority there has been nothing of the kind for several decades, and state contacts of this kind were severed in practice in 1940." He adds: "and first and foremost, what is expressed in this is the attitude of the Swedish Government and the Rikstag, that is the parliament, to all those events and to the endeavors of the Estonian people first and foremost: that is, to a certain degree—or up to a point—a kind of an endorsement of the process of becoming independent." Talvik interjects that it seems to him that a lot has changed in Sweden with so many Estonians visiting Sweden within the past couple of weeks, and he names Foreign Minister Lennart Meri, Deputy Supreme Soviet Speaker Marju Lauristin, Prime Minister Edgar Savisaar, Arnold Ryuytel, and those who accompanied him.

Ryuytel goes on to talk about his conversation with Swedish Prime Minister Ingvar Carlsson which lasted over an hour and during which economic links were discussed as well as communication links, the Estonian and the Baltic in general political situation, the Baltic Council, and the new Estonian currency. He then goes on to discuss the subject of Estonia's pre-war deposit of 2,906 kilos of gold in Sweden. "I did not raise the issue consciously as some kind of a problem that this gold is immediately required," Ryuytel says, "but simply as a general principle, with the issue evidently going to be raised, and evidently this issue is for us to be resolved in

connection with creating our own currency and the guarantees for it. And his [Carlsson's] attitude to this was positive." Ryuytel adds that Carlsson instructed somebody to look into this matter and emphasizes once more that he raised the issue not in the way of a pretension but in the way of an issue to which both he and Carlsson will have to return one day.

Ryuytel says he also met with Karin Soder, chairman of the Nordic Council, and they talked about cooperation and contacts for Estonia and the other two Baltic republics with the Nordic Council. "And we found that it would be very logical for us to have a representation there [within the Nordic Council] as observers." Ecological and cultural links were also discussed, Ryuytel adds.

Poldroos then recalls an embarrassing incident which took place at the delegation's press conference when Tunne Kelam, chairman of the Estonian Committee—who was not a part of the delegation—suddenly appeared and sat down next to Ryuytel, expecting also to answer questions and even sign a document together with him but Ryuytel politely declined. Poldroos adds that when he watched the news on Swedish television later that day, Kelam's presence had been completely edited out.

Ryuytel adds that an agreement was reached with the speaker of the Swedish Parliament about future visits. Delegations will be exchanged with Estonian Supreme Soviet deputies going to Sweden later in the year to see the work of the parliament there, and Swedes visiting Estonia for the same purpose. "So that, in a word, contacts will become fairly close, and I believe that this will create preconditions also for all kinds of other levels, whether economic or cultural, because, finally, it will serve indeed as a basis to everything that there are links created between the states on the top level.

Poldroos comments on the importance of the delegation's visit . he says: "In this case things were rather special. This was perhaps made clear to us quietly and discreetly once we were there. Namely, the Swedish parliament invites only representatives of those countries' parliaments—in the way of official delegations—whom Sweden recognizes diplomatically; that is the rule. Now, in our case, it has been decided to make an exception to this rule. And speaking to several parties, by the way—this story came out again on several occasions and was reported by various people—that they had been deliberating the matter very carefully and were terribly satisfied that they had suddenly found this bizarre move, which was said to be a very interesting move and would certainly go down in the history of diplomacy as a move—or in textbooks—of what is also possible to do, so that in essence this [fact of inviting us) constitutes a kind of, well, preliminary recognition or something like that. So, that it is not as yet possible to recognize the situation as it is, as such; this already signifies respect, well, er... that is, inviting a Supreme Soviet delegation signifies firstly a kind of near recognition acceptance, let us say, of the Republic of Estonia as well as an acceptance of the Supreme Soviet in the way of [word indistinct]."

Briefly, the subject of visa difficulties is touched upon, with Ryuytel having received assurances from Vasilyev who is standing in for the Soviet ambassador at the embassy and whom he had met at a reception.

Enn Leisson, who is member of both Estonian Committee and Supreme Soviet, recalls the subject of relations between the two bodies. "Well, first of all I would like to emphasize once more namely this piece of news which was already voiced in today's Aktuaalne Kaamera [television program] that is: A public opinion poll has taken place and the stances of the Estonian Committee were shared by 12 percent of those questioned." Leisson argues against the view that there is no cooperation between the two bodies and points out that the Supreme Soviet speaker Ulo Nugis and his deputy, Marju Lauristin, are deputies to the Estonian Congress, with Prime Minister Edgar Savisaar and three of his government's ministers being members of the Estonian Committee, and over 40 percent of Supreme Soviet deputies are either in the Estonian Committee or deputies of the Estonian Congress. He concludes the program with an invitation to the viewers to write in with their views on this intricate subject.

Estonia's Savisaar Meets With Interior Minister

LD0806213290 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 1700 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Text] As reported, Edgar Savisaar, leader of the republic of Estonia government, is presently in Moscow, and in the afternoon he met with Bakatin, minister of internal affairs. We hope to obtain news of what was discussed during our evening news at 2200 [1800 GMT].

Estonian Party Official on Ties With Moscow

LD0806221990 Tallinn RAHVA HAAL in Estonian 29 May 90 p 2

[Endel Tivas article: "Growing Pressure From Moscow"]

[Excerpts] **A couple of days ago the leaders of the independent Estonian Communist Party Central Committee, as well as those based on the CPSU platform, went to Moscow where they had a discussion with leading Central Committee officials. So why were the secretaries called to Moscow? This question will be answered by Enn-Arno Sillari, first secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee.**

"The invitation to this effect came unexpectedly for us, too. Once we were there, we learned that the post-20th congress activity of the Estonian Communist Party will be under discussion. Recently a Moscow commission visited Estonia on this matter, and now it has presented its stances to the Central Committee. Thus, it was mainly

the commission material being sifted and conclusions drawn from it. The discussion was led by Andrey Girenko."

You have emphasized that the CPSU Central Committee recognizes the independent Communist Party of Estonia; that there is to be even a Politburo resolution to this effect. Has Moscow's attitude to the Estonian Communist Party changed now?

"One can say that that is so, and quite considerably. This can be concluded from the discussion. Probably the center has changed its attitude in connection with the [Estonian] Supreme Soviet resolution in respect of Estonia becoming independent. The Estonian Communist Party Central Committee and myself were accused of lending support to establishing Estonia's statehood, that is of not making a stand against the will of the people. In order to confirm what was being said, the fifth Estonian Communist Party Central Committee plenum was recalled: it had lent understanding support to Estonia's independence.

Likewise, we were reproached for observing closely the program and resolutions adopted at the 20th Congress of the Estonian Communist Party and for not cooperating with the Gusev-Panilov party. It, however, is implementing the course of the Inter-Movement and the strike committee and is fighting in every way against Estonian independence.

Most of all I was amazed that even after abolishing Article 6 in the Constitution there are no particular shifts noticeable in the center. The understandng that the party leads and directs the life of the whole society—as before—has gained an upper hand. This was expressed also in the question: why has the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee until now not condemned Supreme Soviet laws and made a stand against the activity of Arnold Ryuytel, chairman of the Supreme Soviet. Again and again this note sounded out: why do you direct so poorly?"

What conclusions can one draw from the whole discussion?

"The aim of the center is fairly clear: to shape the Estonian Communist Party into a striking force to fight against the republic of Estonia's Supreme Soviet and its legal government. For this reason support in every sense was given to the understandings of the other side, and it was found that this is what true communists should be like. What can one do when understandings of ours diverge on this matter?"

Was the subject of the party's property division also raised at the Central Committee?

"Not on this occasion, but it definitely will be in the future. This has been confirmed by what has happened in Lithuania and Latvia. In Estonia, too the CPSU has spent millions in order to found administrative buildings, publishing houses and other buildings. There is no wish to give those up at all." [passage omitted]

It seems that the pressure from the center on the Estonian Communist Party keeps increasing and there is nothing left of the initial agreements. How can one substantiate this?

"The Gusev-Panfilov party has not been sitting idly by in the meantime. Their aim is to rally most communists under their flag and to start running the affairs of all Estonia. Sympathy from Moscow in any case belongs to them at the moment." [passage omitted]

Latvian Supreme Soviet Session Resumes

LD1106213790 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 0430 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] Today the first session of the Supreme Soviet of the republic of Latvia is continuing its work. At the start of the week, that is, also today, there will be plenary sessions, but at the end of the week work will again proceed in commissions, deputies will meet with voters, and will also carry out other tasks. Letters are coming in all the time to the editorial office in connection with the session's radio relays. Some express regret that they cannot hear everything. Others, and these are the majority, acknowledge the logic of the deputies' decision not to relay the session in future, but regularly to inform of everything decided there. This is what we will do today too, and on the following days of the week.

Judiciary Posts Discussed

LD1106215290 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 1310 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] The Supreme Soviet session continued its work today. At 1100 [0800 GMT] the registration of deputies for the plenary session showed 139 deputies in the hall. On the agenda for the session are the elections to the Supreme Court of the republic of Latvia. The sitting began with the election of the deputy to the Supreme Court chairman, Gvido Zemribo. The leaders of the Commissions on Defense and Internal Affairs, as well as on legislation, stated the attitude of these commissions towards the proposed candidacies. As noted later, the conclusions were at times expressed as the motivation.

Gvido Zemribo recommended Janis Vilbers for the position as first deputy to the chairman of the Supreme Court. With 50 deputies voting in favor, 59 against, and 29 abstaining, Vilbers' candidacy was rejected. In turn, elected as deputy to the Supreme Court chairman was (Martins Dubelis). The changing number of deputies who had registered shows that some deputies participate episodically in the work of the parliament.

The session continued with the election of members of the Supreme Court. Today 12 candidacies will be examined, of which seven will be confirmed as members of the Supreme Court. In the afternoon, the deputies will work in factions.

Pro-Moscow Latvian Party Congress Held

LD0906225990 Moscow TASS in English 2103 GMT 9 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Valeriy Zaitsev]

[Text] Riga June 10 TASS—The 25th Congress of the Latvian Communist Party (LCP) resumed its work on Saturday after a two-month interval. Items on the agenda of the congress are the LCP tactics at the present stage, the results of the discussion of the draft platform of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee and draft rules of the CPSU and the election of delegates to the CPSU's 28th Congress.

The congress decided to withdraw mandates from those delegates (of whom there are more than 140 out of 797) who after the first session of the congress were expelled from the CPSU for undermining the ideological and organisational unity of the party, and from those who became members of the leading bodies of the independent LCP or filed applications about their unwillingness to remain CPSU members.

A report about the LCP tactics was delivered by party chief Alfred Rubiks.

Speakers at the congress pointed out that the Popular Front and the Latvian Communist Party should be reckoned the main opposite political forces in the republic that struggle for power and for the right to define statehood.

The LCP is of the opinion that the independence of the republic, its political sovereignty and a rise in the population's living standards should be ensured while remaining within the USSR.

But it is essential to determine relationships with the Union as a whole and with the other subjects of the Union on the strength of new sociopolitical conditions.

The communists are prepared to cooperate with the present government of Latvia in those directs [as received] which accord with the constitutional order and which do not encroach on the declared rights and freedoms of people and do not lead the republic to a unilateral withdrawal from the USSR, and will promote the development of Latvia's economic independence within the framework of the Soviet Federation.

The congress adopted a resolution on "The 50th anniversary of the restoration of Soviet power in Latvia," urging people to mark the 50th anniversary of the restoration of Soviet power in Latvia and of the formation of the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] as an important landmark in the life of the people, and as an integral part of their life, concerns, hopes, and lessons for the future.

Correspondent Reports on Latvian Food Rationing

LD0706105190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0830 GMT 7 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] What is troubling the people of Latvia in these first days of summer? Our correspondent's report.

[N. Kasyanova] Macaroni fever has hit the shops in the towns and villages of the republic with devastating force. Rumors, each more alarming than the last, drove on even those who didn't want to believe all the talk that was flying around. At any moment, unless you produced a ration card, you would not be able to buy a pack of salt. Finally, the people of Riga found out about a coupon system of distributing flour, groats, and pasta. The rations per person are somewhat confusing, too: two kilograms of flour for four months, that is half a kilogramme per month, and even less for macaroni, 500 grams for two months.

[Begin A.A. Plaudis, Latvian minister of trade recording] I think the rationing system, which is now being introduced mainly through a decision by the local soviet bodies, has been brought about by the need to ensure a socially just distribution system which will enable everyone in the public to buy given food products. [end recording] [video shows exterior and interior of food shop with shelves of preserves and canned produce, as well as some empty shelves]

*Latvian Agriculture, Education Ministers Named

90P50030

[Editorial Report] Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian for 26 May 1990 on page 7 published two decrees of the Latvian Republic Supreme Soviet dated 15 and 18 May, respectively, naming **Dainis Gegeris** to the post of Minister of Agriculture of the Latvian Republic and **Andris Piebalgs to the post of Minister of Education of the Latvian Repulbic.**

Correction to Appointment of Latvian Ministers

WA1206143990

The following correction pertains to the item entitled "Latvian Republic Ministers Appointed" published on page 87 of the 11 June 1990 Soviet Union DAILY REPORT:

Page 87, column one, under the "15 May decrees" subtitle, the fourth paragraph should read: Minister of Railways of the Latvian... (substituting "Railways" for "Communications").

RSFSR

Draft Sovereignty Declaration Read at Session

LD1206010890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1724 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Draft Declaration on the Sovereignty of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic read at the First RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies in Moscow on 11 June—recorded]

[Text] [(Onichkin)] Esteemed people's deputies, esteemed Boris Nikolayevich [Yeltsin], I am People's Deputy (Onichkin), District 524, City of Novosibirsk. Today, I phoned my electorate and they asked that the declaration of sovereignty for the Russian Federation be read out in full before we discuss it by article, so that they can form an overall idea of what is being discussed. I ask that you to do that. Thank you for your attention.

[Isayev] That can be done. Thank you. So. [commotion in hall] No, it has been handed out to us....

[Yeltsin, interrupting] [Words indistinct] viewers.

[Isayev] But our electorate has to become acquainted with that declaration. The millions of inhabitants who are sitting at their television screens, they do not know the text of the declaration. Therefore, the proposal is accepted.

[Yeltsin] Five minutes.

[Isayev] It is a five-minute matter. So, allow me to read out the full text of the declaration with the adopted fifth article.

The declaration on the state sovereignty of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR]:

The First Congress of People's Deputies of Russia, recognizing these historic responsibilities for the fate of Russia, and as a mark of its respect for the sovereign rights of all peoples united in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, expressing the will of the peoples of the Russian Federation...

The first version:

Solemnly proclaims the state sovereignty of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic throughout its territory, and proclaims its determination to create a democratic law-governed state as part of a renewed Union of Soviet Socialist Republic.

The second version:

Solemnly proclaims the state sovereignty of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic throughout its territory, and proclaims its determination to create a democratic law-governed state as part of a renewed union of sovereign republics, of states.

Article 1: The Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic is a sovereign state, created by peoples historically united in it.

Article 2: The sovereignty of the RSFSR is a natural and necessary condition for the existence of the statehood of Russia, which has a centuries-long history, culture, and tradition.

Article 3: Its multi-national people is the bearer of sovereignty and the source of state power in the RSFSR. The people implement state power directly—through representative bodies—on the basis of the RSFSR Constitution.

Article 4: The state sovereignty of the RSFSR is proclaimed in the name of the highest aims of guaranteeing to every person the inalienable right to a worthy life and free development and use of his native language, and to every people [the right] to self-determination in the national state and national cultural forms it chooses.

Article 5: To guarantee the political, economic, and legal provisions of the sovereignty of the RSFSR, the fullness of the power of the RSFSR in deciding all questions of the state and social life is established, with the exception of those it voluntarily hands over to the control of the Union of the SSR, as is the supremacy of the RSFSR Constitution and of the laws of the RSFSR for the entire territory of the RSFSR.

The first version:

The effect of the Acts of the USSR that contradict the sovereign rights of the RSFSR are suspended by the Republic throughout its territory. Disagreements between the Republic and the Union are to be resolved according to the procedure set by the Union Treaty.

The second version:

[Commotion in hall. Yeltsin says, "There is no second one, the first one has been adopted." Isayev responds, "Yes, the first one has been adopted, correct," then continues reading.] The exclusive right of the people to the possession, use, and disposal of the national wealth of Russia, the plenipotentiary representation of the RSFSR in other union republics and foreign countries [is established, as is] the right of the Republic to take part in [stumbles over words] implementing the powers handed over by it to the Union of the SSR.

Article 6: The Russian Soviet Federated Socialist unites with other republics in the Union on the basis of the Treaty. The RSFSR recognizes and respects the sovereign rights of the union republics and of the Union of the SSR.

Article 7: The RSFSR retains the right of free secession from the USSR according to the procedure established by the Union Treaty and by the legislation it is based upon.

Article 8: The territory of the RSFSR may not be altered without its consent.

Article 9: Autonomous republics, autonomous oblasts, and autonomous okrugs are part of the RSFSR on the basis of the free self-determination of peoples, and possess the whole fullness of power throughout their territory outside of the powers they transfer to the care of the RSFSR and the USSR. The Congress confirms the need to go over to a constitutional treaty basis for relations between the RSFSR and the autonomous republics, autonomous oblasts, and autonomous okrugs, which are a part of it.

Article 10: All citizens and persons with no citizenship who live in the territory of the RSFSR are guaranteed the rights and freedoms provided in the RSFSR Constitution, the USSR Constitution, and the generally recognized norms of international law. Representatives of nations and ethnic minorities who live in the RSFSR outside the boundaries of their national-state formations, or who have none in the RSFSR's territory, are guaranteed their legitimate political, economic, ethnic, and cultural rights.

Article 11: Republican citizenship of the RSFSR is established throughout the territory of the RSFSR. Every citizen of the RSFSR preserves his USSR citizenship. Citizens of the RSFSR outside the boundaries of the republic are under the protection of the RSFSR.

Article 12. The RSFSR guarantees all political parties, public organizations, and mass movements that act within the framework of the RSFSR Constitution equal legal opportunity to take part in the government of state and public affairs.

Article 13: The division of economic, legislative, executive, and judicial powers is a key principle for the functioning of the RSFSR as a law-governed state.

Article 14: The RSFSR declares its adherence to the generally recognized principles of international law and its readiness to live in peace and harmony with all countries and peoples of the world, and to adopt every measure to prevent confrontation in the settlement of international and inter-republican conflicts.

Article 15: This declaration is the basis for drafting the new constitution, the conclusion of a Union Treaty, and the improvement of republican legislation—that is the first version.

The second version of Article 15:

This declaration comes into force from the moment of adoption by the First Congress of People's Deputies, and is the basis for the drafting of a new RSFSR constitution, the conclusion of a new Union Treaty, and the improvement of republican legislation.

That is the text of the draft declaration.

Congress Adopts Sovereignty Amendments

LD1206013290

Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1400-2150 GMT on 11 June carries a recording of the 11 June proceedings of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Congress of People's Deputies.

At 1845 GMT in the recording the congress begins an article-by- article discussion of the draft declaration of the RSFSR sovereignty. In order of action the congress then makes the following decisions on the declaration's articles:

The first version of Article 15 is adopted. It reads: This declaration is the basis for drafting the new Constitution, the conclusion of a Union treaty, and the improvement of republican legislation.

The first version of the preamble is adopted. It reads: The First Congress of People's Deputies of Russia, recognizing the historic responsibility for the fate of Russia, and as a mark of its respect for the sovereign rights of all peoples united in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, expressing the will of the peoples of the Russian Federation, solemnly proclaims the state sovereignty of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic throughout its territory and proclaims its determination to create a democratic law-governed state as part of a renewed Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics.

Articles one, two, three, and four are adopted without amendment.

Article five is noted to have been adopted on 9 June 1990.

Articles six and seven are adopted without amendment.

Article eight is amended to read: The territory of the RSFSR may not be altered without an expression of the will of its population, by a referendum.

Article nine is not adopted in any form and is to be redrafted.

Articles 10 and 11 were adopted without amendment.

Article 12 is amended to read: The RSFSR guarantees all RSFSR citizens, political parties, public and religious organizations, and mass movements that act within the framework of the RSFSR Constitution equal and legal opportunity to participate in government of state and public affairs.

Articles 13 and 14 await debate.

Moscow TV Relays 11 June Congress Proceedings

Media Relations Viewed

LD1106145590

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1400 GMT on 11 June begins a recorded relay of the 11 June proceedings at the RSFSR (Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic) Congress of People's Deputies. The relay begins by showing deputies standing before the Russian flag at a call from Chairman Isayev.

At 1401 GMT the floor is given to Primakov. He says Gorbachev has asked him to read a message to the Russian congress. The message says the claims that Yeltsin's interview with Central Television was delayed are nothing but fabrication. Gorbachev also demands a public apology from those deputies who have besmirched his name. Primakov then goes on to give his own comment on the message.

At 1404 GMT Isayev says it was denied on Saturday to set up a commission on relations with the press.

AT 1405 GMT Deputy Gurevich is given the floor to talk about the commission set up to coordinate with the media. Gurevich reads the list of candidates for the commission and the members' credentials. The chairman suggests cutting the numbers down a little and proposes that the deputies register to vote on the subject. Registration shows 918 present.

At 1413 GMT Isayev asks: Who wants the commission in its entirety as proposed by Gurevich? 671 are in favor; 150 against; and 54 abstentions.

At 1414 GMT a clergyman speaks from the floor to complain that two football programs interrupted coverage of the congress proceedings, much to the electorate's disgust.

At 1415 GMT Deputy (Yushenkov) complains about the time taken up by procedural matters. He asks whether Gorbachev congratulated Yeltsin on his election as chairman, and if so where can he read this?

At 1417 GMT Primakov is given the floor to respond to this question. The USSR president has never congratulated in written form any president of any Union republic, he says.

At 1419 GMT (Starchenko) speaks from the floor on procedure again. He is empowered, he says, to read a message to Yeltsin from the founding congress of the RSFSR healthworkers, in which they complain of the critical state of the health service and particularly low pay. They have several demands to rectify matters.

At 1422 GMT Isayev gives the floor to Sidorenko, chairman of the tellers' commission, to deal with the nomination of Supreme Soviet members. Sidorenko names a number of districts, giving the number of candidates and their names. Deputy Kislyuk interrupts him to put forward three new candidates who are miners. He also withdraws his own nomination.

At 1428 GMT a deputy takes issue with Kislyuk's statement.

At 1429 GMT Deputy Denisenko explains her reasons for withdrawing her candidacy, which appear to be bound up with the low level of parliamentary culture so far apparent.

At 1430 GMT Deputy Mikhaylets from Kemerovo speaks from the floor in opposition to the previous speaker. He, too, withdraws his candicacy, saying he can do more for Kemerovo on the spot.

At 1432 GMT Isayev says it was agreed on Saturday to put an end to nominations. Only withdrawals can now be dealt with.

At 1434 GMT Deputy Parshukhov threatens to withdraw if another candidate goes ahead. He is warned that this sort of thing is not on. Deputy Sivak asks who gave the chairmen the right to change congress decisions, that is, to put an end to nominations and withdrawals.

At 1436 GMT Sidorenko continues his list of candidates. Isayev reads a request from Smolensk to have Deputy Bychkov withdrawn as a candidate. Bychkov refuses to withdraw his candidacy. The announcer then says the relay will resume at 1715 GMT after the showing of a football game.

Sovereignty Debated

LD1106182490

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1715 GMT on 11 June resumes a recording of the 11 June proceedings at the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies. Isayev is in the chair.

At this time, Isayev says the compilation of list of nominations of Supreme Soviet members is complete. Deputy Formosov protests the self-nomination by several candidates. A deputy from Gorkiy speaks in support of Kemerovo deputies. Deputy Revyakin requests that experts participate in the work of the Supreme Soviet, and that the government be attentive to the fuel and power industry. Deputy Sergeyev defends nominations which have been called self- nominations, but are not. Deputy (Yershenkov) says on behalf of the "left radicals" that they will boycott this election and he calls a meeting.

At 1721 GMT Isayev calls a vote on ending debate on nominations. The motion is passed by 825 to 52. Isayev says the deputies will now go on to discuss the draft declaration on the sovereignty of Russia. It is proposed that the declaration be debated article by article.

At 1724 GMT Isayev reads out two proposed amendments to the preamble. A deputy from Novosibirsk says his voters have asked for the declaration to be read out in

full so they know what is being discussed. Isayev reads the declaration, including proposed amendments.

At 1733 GMT Isayev asks for comments and proposals on the preamble. Deputy Muravyev says it is too long and suggests cuts. Isayev says they can only vote on proposals if they are submitted to the Secretariat in writing. Deputy Drozdenko comments on the poor style of wording. Deputy Ustinov says the style makes the meaning unclear and offers different wording in relation to the Union treaty. Deputy Mashkov supports one of the proposed versions. Deputy (Kiselev) offers wording which covers republics which are "part of" rather than "united in" the Union, so as not to offend republics which have said they are not willing members.

At 1740 GMT Isayev proposes a vote on the last suggestion. The proposal fails, 477 votes for, 232 against, 44 abstentions.

At 1742 GMT Deputy Fedoseyev makes a point about what kind of majority is required for amendments. Deputy Babayev says they must decide if this is a political or a legislative document. The nature of the declaration calls for a qualified majority. Isayev says legal advice is being taken. Deputy Tikhonov says the document does not address the right issues as far as nationalities are concerned, and speaks in favor of the first version. Isayev calls for a vote on passing the second version. The second version is rejected: 356 for, 420 against and 27 abstentions. The vote on the first version is interrupted for Deputy Rasskazov to speak, calling for voting by name, as agreed earlier. Deputy Guskov proposes a named vote and a qualified majority. Isayev says the document is a political one, requiring only a simple majority. Depouty Surkov offers legal advice, referring to standing orders. Laws are adopted by a simple majority of total membership; a qualified majority is required only for amendments to the Constitution, says Surkov.

At 1751 GMT Isayev calls for a vote on voting by name. The motion passes, 671 for, 194 against, 20 abstentions.

At 1752 GMT an unidentified deputy says the preamble tries to prejudge what the future Union will be, a federation or a confederation, and offers amendments to get around this. Deputy Kovalev says they will never get through debate if every oral proposal is voted on, and he proposes an immediate vote an article at a time. Deputy Baburin returns to the kind of majority required; if it is to involve changes to the Constitution, a two-thirds majority should be required. Deputy Shebaldayev takes issue with Baburin, saying that the declaration should be considered a political document.

Voting Procedures Debated

LD1106195190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1800 GMT on 11 June continues a recording of the 11 June proceedings at the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies.

At this time, Deputy Serdyakov says the declaration is confused over what the "subjects of federation" are, and he objects to the idea suggested by the preamble that the congress is creating a state; the state has existed for a long time, he says. Deputy Shabak suggests that coinciding passages in the two proposed versions be considered adopted, and he speaks in favor of the second version.

At 1803 GMT Deputy Sergeyev proposes that the deputies vote on the declaration first and decide how to regard it afterwards, according to whether a qualified majority is available or not. Deputy Rudkin speaks in favor of a two-thirds majority requirement. Deputy Shapochkin says no further amendments should be considered. Deputy Grigoryev calls for a two-thirds majority vote. Deputy Vasilyev complains about the poor editorial standards of the drafting commission, which has again presented a "raw" document. Deputy Belov refers to Article 15 of the declaration, concerning its relationship to the Constitution, meaning that a two-thirds majority is needed. Deputy (Glushkov) supports a named vote and two-thirds majority. Deputy Stepanov suggests voting on the declaration as a basis only, then publishing it for public discussion before adoption.

At 1812 GMT Deputy Dedichenko proposes an amendment to Article 13 in connection with the mention of a law-governed state in the first proposed version of the preamble. Deputy Repin suggests less talking and more voting. Deputy Ivano says the congress is losing its way again and complains about the work of the drafting commission. Deputy Volkov, a lawyer, says only a simple majority is going to be required for the declaration, and complains about the quality of drafting.

At 1819 GMT a deputy from Udmurtia says both ultra-left and ultra-right wing deputies are hampering the debate. Deputy Lugovoy talks about the richness of the Russian language and proposes a two-thirds vote on the declaration.

At 1821 GMT Deputy (Kazhokin) takes the stand: he makes comparisons with U.S. laws, urges the adotion of the declaration.

At 1823 GMT another deputy from Khabarovsk talks about voting on the declaration; Article 15 should be put to the vote to avoid clashes with the Constitution, he says.

At 1825 GMT Grachev reads out remarks from other deputies, questions on radiation in the RSFSR, on Armenia, and others.

At 1827 GMT a 30-minute break is announced.

At 1828 GMT Yeltsin, in the chair, says voting needs to be conducted soon; the tellers' commission is ready in the Georgiyevskiy Hall.

At 1829 GMT Sayenko reads a message from two deputies' groups supporting all candidacies and calling on support for specific candidates.

Voting, Debates on Articles

LD1106205190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1831 GMT on 11 June continues a recording of the 11 June proceedings at the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies. At this time, Deputy (Telnov), chairman of the subcommission that drew up the sovereignty declaration says deputies are free to vote as they wish, as they think. He stresses the importance of the document, the declaration. (Telnov) lists those deputies that took part in drawing up the declaration, and outlines the work that was done, the proposals forwarded on a paragraph on the rights and freedom of people in RSFSR territory. According to (Telnov), the citizens of the RSFSR outside its territory will be protected by the RSFSR proposal. The RSFSR is to unite with other republics in a federation. The rights of autonomous and other republics are to be expanded by the draft document. The first variant of the document is preferable with its preamble to the second variant, says (Telnov). He outlines matters that were not accepted, expresses thanks to those who helped in the work, and talks about the intricacies of voting on the declaration. (Telnov) suggests that the auditing commission should sit for about an hour today and then they could vote.

At 1845 GMT Yeltsin suggests exluding Article 15 from voting, and suggests voting on all the other articles first. He asks for a vote on this. Vote result: Yeltsin's suggestion is not approved. Deputies call for the first variant and vote on the first variant of Article 15: Result: 762 for, 113 against, 17 abstentions.

Yeltsin talks about the procedure for voting and amendments. Voting takes place on the preamble, first variant: 629 for, 261 against, 15 sbstentions.

Voting on introduced amendments is next. (Telnov) intervenes to talk about preamble amendments. He says voting is also necessasry for the second variant of the preamble. Yeltsin reads out an amendment just in. Voting on this amendment: 296 for, 557 against, 32 abstentions.

Voting is held on Article 1: 875 for, 30 against, 10 abstentions. There are no amendments. Article 1 is adopted in its entirety.

Voting takes place on whether to adopt Article 2: 914 for, one against, two abstentions. Article 2 is adopted.

Voting takes place on whether to adopt Article 3: 909 for, five against, three abstentions. There are no amendments. Yeltsin reads out Article 3.

Voting takes place on whether to adopt Article 4: 902 for, eight against, six abstentions. Yeltsin reads out an amendment to Article 4 from Deputy Gritsenko on socialist choice. Voting takes place on the amendment: 226 for, 620 against, 48 abstentions.

Yeltsin announces that Article 5 has been adopted without amendments, because there weren't any at the time. The deputies vote on not returning to voting on Article 5: 651 for, 217 against, 34 abstentions. Yeltsin reads out Article 5.

At 1914 GMT voting is held on whether to adopt Article 6: 912 for, five against, five abstentions. Yeltsin reads out an amendment for Deputy Kapelov on wording of article. A vote is held on the amendment: 104 for, 799 against, 15 abstentions. The next amendment is put to a vote and not adopted. Yeltsin announces a break until 1600 Moscow time.

Debates Continue

LD1106214890

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1920 GMT on 11 June continues a recording of the 11 June proceedings at the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies. At this time, the evening session begins. Yeltsin is in the chair.

Yeltsin reads the proposed greetings to be sent to the new patriarch of the Orthodox Church. A show of hands is in favor of the wording.

At 1924 GMT Deputy Slobodkin points out that the greetings should come from the "RSFSR Congress" not the "Russian Congress" of People's Deputies; Yeltsin agrees. He reads out five further proposals for amendments to article 6: all are rejected by vote. Yeltsin reads the text of Article 6.

At 1934 GMT Article 7 is voted on: 875 for, 26 against, eight abstentions. Deputy Sergeyev proposes amending the article by excluding it, since it is already covered by the Constitution. Yeltsin says they have already voted on the article and this is no amendment, but the proposal is acceptable if it gets a two-thirds majority. A vote is taken: 166 for, 686 against, 36 abstentions.

At 1941 GMT a further amendment cutting a sentence short is voted on; it is rejected. Yeltsin reads out the text of Article 7.

At 1943 GMT a vote is held on Article 8: 878 for, 25 against, six abstentions. Deputy Churkin speaks proposing his amendment, stressing that people must be sovereign on their own territory. His wording proposes a referendum for any change to borders. Vote is in favor: 747 for, 143 against, 15 abstentions. Yeltsin reads the version of Article 8 as amended.

At 1951 GMT Deputy Babkin agrees with the amendment, but wants further amendments concerning past changes. An expert suggests leaving such discussion for

later saying the article is fine as it is. An unidentified deputy proposes specifying the need for agreement of autonomous formations. Deputy Ivanov says the Union treaty is likely to allow autonomous republics to leave the RSFSR, so they would end up with same status as Union republics. Deputy Ispravnikov proposes an amendment giving the RSFSR sole rights to setting administrative divisions. The first amendment is put to a vote; it fails. The second also fails. A deputy speaks from the rostrum, saying very serious issues are being decided on and proposes returning to the original text if a two-thirds majority supports this. Another deputy suggests that the article is already accounted for in the provisions of the Constitution. A female deputy from the rostrum makes a similar point. Yeltsin says general feeling is against a vote, and he rereads the already adopted text of article 8.

At 2006 GMT debate begins on Article 9. Deputy Kiselev speaks about the delegation of powers from the Union implied in the wording, and suggests a specific point concerning autonomous republics. Deputy Khutys suggests an addition concerning abandoned villages. A vote is taken on the first version of Article 9: It is rejected, 373 votes for, 471 against, 42 abstentions. A vote is taken on the second version: 525 for, 323 against 53 abstentions, so it is rejected. Deputy Serdyakov suggests a wording stressing the federal nature of the republic. An unidentified deputy speaks in favor of the first version. Deputy Sabirov speaks on behalf of deputies from autonomous formations; he appeals to governments of the latter to consider full sovereignty including the right of secession for autonomous republics. A deputy involved in drafting the declaration speaks, noting the need for great care when dealing with article 9 concerning nationalities. The declaration must not preclude changes in nationality relations; the wording should be left as it is, he says.

At 2020 GMT Deputy (Zhilin) says he came to the congress as an internationalist, but sees divisive forces at work here. He suggests no vote on Article 9. Yeltsin suggests cutting of debates on Article 9 and going on to Article 10. The suggestion is put to a vote and is accepted.

Autonomous Regions Viewed

LD1106221790

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2024 GMT on 11 June continues a recording of the 11 June proceedings at the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies.

At this time, deputies vote on Article 10 of the sovereignty declaration. The results of the vote: 844 for, six against, eight abstentions. The article is adopted.

At 2025 GMT Deputy Kovalev says the rights of autonomy have been sharply restricted, for example, by voting to hold referenda. Thus, the Karabakh issue will never be resolved, he says.

At 2027 GMT Deputy Leontev says a mistake is being made today by not discussing Article 9. Autonomous formations need to consult each other. Deputy (Khorayev) discusses the sovereignty of autonomous formations. Another deputy says people did not vote for them to not protect their rights—this deputy says he will not vote further.

At 2031 GMT Deputy Akhmetov speaks of the sovereignty of autonomous formations. He suggests that the congress halt work for 30 minutes to allow for consultations on this matter Deputy (Iugovoy) asks for passions to be restrained.

At 2034 GMT Yeltsin says: we must not get into an impasse, we must find a compromise. If we take away the second part of Article 9, will we get a consensus, asks Yeltsin? Deputy Dmitriyev proposes that nothing should be taken away from the article and suggests going on to other articles and going back to article 9 at another time.

At 2035 GMT Yeltsin proposes returning article 9 to the commission for additional work. A vote is taken on this: 807 for, 28 against, nine abstentions.

Deputies move on to amendments for Article 10, and voting on the amendments. The amendment from Zakharov is not accepted; amendment from Sokolov is not accepted; amendment from Boborin is not accepted; amendment from Krivoshapkin is not accepted; amendment from Sevastianov is not accepted. Deputy Bashkirian takes the floor, complains about past errors in forming borders in reference to Article 9 and proposes an amendment.

At 2050 GMT Yeltsin reads out the latter amendment on the rights of autonomous formations, and asks for a vote: 101 for, 702 against, 58 abstentions.

At 2053 GMT voting takes place on Article 11: 871 for, 12 against, four abstentions. Yeltsin says the commission is working on Article 9. Amendments from deputies are voted upon. The amendment from Matochkin is not adopted; the amendment from Deputy Sirotkin is not adopted. Yeltsin reads out Article 11 as adopted.

At 2059 GMT Stepanov speaks about an amendment he has put forward to Article 5. Yeltsin says it has been agreed not to return to Article 5. He asks for a vote on Stepanov's amendment, which would need a two-thirds majority to pass. It receives 290 votes for, 513 against, 40 abstentions.

At 2102 GMT a vote is taken on Article 12: it is adopted by 838 for, 12 against, 10 abstentions. Yeltsin reads a proposed addition from Deputy Polosin, concerning organizations. A deputy in priest's garb supports the amendment, as it enables the church to take an active part in society. The amendment is put to a vote and adopted 574 for, 248 against, 42 abstentions.

At 2107 GMT an unidentified deputy speaks, offering an amendment to the wording concerning citizens and political parties. The amendment is passed. Deputy

(Mazayev) speaks about the principle of political pluralism involved. Deputy Pudovkin comes to the rostrum to explain an amendment to the wording which Yeltsin cannot make sense of. It is put to a vote and fails. Several amendments need no vote as they are covered by the first amendment just passed. An amendment on access to broadcasting time is voted on; it fails. Deputy Serdyukov's amendment to the wording of one phrase is read out; he comes to the rostrum to explain it. The vote goes against it. Yeltsin reads out the adopted version of Article 12. A deputy from Severodvinsk says his written proposal for an amendment has not been dealth with; it concerns the right to be involved in cooperatives. A deputy protests at the amendment already passed—all citizens including prisoners, get equal rights thanks to it, he says. A vote is held on the Severodvinsk deputy's amendment, and it is rejected. Article 12 stands as just read out.

Voting Results Read

LD1106222690

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2124 GMT on 11 June continues a recording of the 11 June proceedings at the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies.

At this time, Yeltsin says Articles 13 and 14 remain. In addition the commission must work on a version of Article 9 that is acceptable. These will be discussed tomorrow. Deputy Kazakov speaks about the Peasant Congress that started today, and reads a message to the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies from the Krasnodar peasant union calling for the RSFSR government to help develop peasant farms. Kazakov asks Yeltsin to meet the farmers after their congress. Yeltsin says he intends to. He reads a proposed message of greetings to the peasant congress.

At 2130 GMT deputies' groups make their announcements.

At 2131 GMT Sidorenko of the tellers' commission reports on the results of voting for the Soviet of the Republic. He gives details of votes for and against each candidate, lists successful candidates for each oblast. A number of areas remain unrepresented, he says. Deputies endorse the report.

At 2145 GMT Sidorenko reports the results of voting for the RSFSR Soviet of Nationalities. Three members were elected from four candidates. Sidorenko says which areas still have no representative. Deputies endorse the report.

At 2148 GMT a deputy queries the count for one constituency.

At 2149 GMT Yeltsin declares the session adjourned. He announces that it will reconvene tomorrow at 0600 GMT.

More on RSFSR Congress Election Results

LD0906133590

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1100 GMT on 9 June carries a three-minute report by Olga Vasilenko on the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Congress of Peoples' Deputies. Vasilenko repeats the Congress of People's Deputies election results for those who have not already heard them: 81 deputies have been elected to the Soviet of the Republic in the new RSFSR Supreme Soviet, and 45 have not. "And no one has been elected from Moscow and Leiningrad. Nor have any miners, including those from Kemerovo." In the case of the Soviet of Nationalities, 121 deuties have been elected, she says. "But deputies did not want to endorse the protocol and demanded a break. Yes, a group of deputies—a large group of deputies, mainly from Democratic Russia and workers—were not elected. But, after all, elections are elections. And, as Deputy Kozhukhin—he's a Muscovite and an historian—said, it is important to champion the implementation of democratic processes. So, why cast doubt on the voting results? Moreover, if one thinks that the Supreme Soviet will be conservative, there is the possibility of holding fresh elections for it after a little while. But, now one must not intensify the confrontation. Compromise must be sought. One further opinion: This Supreme Soviet will be an opposition not only for the chairman, but also for the congress. And the congress can disown all the Supreme Soviet's decisions. So, a break is needed. Constituents must be consulted and then one can decide what to do next." Vasilenko adds that Deputy Zakharov suggested that the second round of voting should take place today.

"The speech made by Deputy Chernov was very biting. He is a worker from Komsomolsk-na-Amure. In fact, he came to see us at the correspondents' center. Well, he said the working class of Russia had suffered a defeat, and accused the bloc of Communists of Russia of being responsible for this, since they had circulated lists of deputies for whom one should, or should not, vote. Well, these workers were among those who should not be voted in."

Deputy Travkin was not too worried by the democrats' defeat. It was all part of the political process, he said: win some, lose some. "Travkin also said that, if the Supreme Soviet were totally conservative, the deputies had decided there will be elections for the Russian presidency, and the president himself could decide what to do with the Supreme Soviet, whether to dissolve it or not.

"Well, it was finally decided, nevertheless, to hold the additional elections today and to assemble on Monday at 1000 in the morning [0600 GMT] to find out the results," Vasilenko concludes.

Secretariat Views Transcaucasian Refugee Status

LD0906221990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1625 GMT 9 Jun 90

[Statement by unidentified RSFSR Council of Ministers Secretariat spokesman at the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies session in Moscow on 9 June—recorded]

[Text] Esteemed comrade deputies, the Secretariat informs you that the commission of the RSFSR Council of Minsters for granting aid to citizens forced to leave the Azerbaijan SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] has provided the following information about the work carried out in connection with the resolution of the refugee problem. As of 7 June 1990,14,000 families are to be found in Moscow city and Moscow Oblast. This represents 31,000 people, as against 17,500 families registered between January and March 7 1990. One thousand families are staying at medical establishments and sanitoriums; originally there were 2,700 such families. Five hundred and eighty-three families have returned to the city of Baku. Six medical and sanitary establishments have been completely vacated, including three pioneer camps.

At the same time there are great difficulties in the work on finding employment and accomodation for refugees. Despite active work to attract them to rural areas where there are opportunities to provide accomodation and employment for all who want them, only 1,400 families have agreed to this. The overwhelming majority of refugees categorically refuse to live in rural areas.

Work is being done with the Council of Ministers of the Azerbaijan SSR on the voluntary return of Russian-speaking citizens to their previous domiciles. The procedure for this work has been determined by an appropriate protocol. Executives are to be found in the city of Baku, on the instructions of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, to resolve the practical issues. A group from Azerbaijan is also present in the Russian Federation for the same work, at the invitation of the RSFSR Council of Ministers.

Work on resolving the problem of refugees has become more active on the part of the local soviets of people's deputies. For example, issues of the provisions of accomodation and employment for refugees, have been practically resolved in Kalinin and Orel Oblasts. However, certain executive committees are not demonstrating any interest in providing refugees with permanent or temporary accomodation, in selling apartments or allocating plots of land for the construction of private houses. Artificial obstacles on the exchange of living space in the city of Baku for other living space in the Russian Federation is holding back the resolution of the refugee problem, as is the absence of union regulations on compensation for accomodation and property, which is arousing serious criticism on the part of the refugees.

The RSFSR government recently has adopted a number of supplementary measures. Issues on the free travel of refugees to the locations to which they have been permanently located and their return to their previous places of residence have been resolved with the USSR Ministry of Communications.

Additional resources have been allocated for material aid to refugees. In accordance with the results of the first half year of 1990, unappropriated capital investment and material and technical resources will be reallocated to the reconstruction of accomodation for refugees and resources have been earmarked from the reserves of the RSFSR Council of Ministers for these purposes. It is planned to build a 100-Apartment housing block as well as three points for the reception and temporary housing of refugees in 15 major towns in the central part of the RSFSR during 1990 and 1991. This document was signed by Comrade Gorshkov, the chairman of the Comission and deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers.

Congress Scheduled To End 18 June

LD1206081690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 Gmt 12 Jun 90

[Text] The First Congress of People's Deputies of Russia, as has already been reported, continued its work in the Great Kremlin Palace today. At the morning sitting, Comrade Yeltsin, who was chairing, reported that the congress will work until the lunch break today and then a sitting of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet, elected by the congress, will begin. It is planned to continue the work of the congress on Friday and Saturday and to end it on Monday 18 June.

New First Deputy Chairman Khasbulatov Interviewed

90UN2055A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 8 Jun 90 p 3

[Interview with Prof. R.I. Khasbulatov, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, by RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA special correspondent S. Kredov; place and date not specified: "'I Did Not Resort to Tactics'"]

[Text] The first deputy chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet was named on Tuesday, 5 June. He is Professor Ruslan Imranovich Khasbulatov, a Muscovite nominated for the congress by the electorate of Groznyy. The candidacy of R.I. Khasbulatov was supported by considerable numbers of deputies from the autonomous regions. On election day our special correspondent S. Kredov put several questions to Ruslan Imranovich.

[Kredov] Permit me to join in the congratulations to you.... How do you explain the congress being quite decisive in its support of your candidacy (when it had seemed that the issue was deadlocked)?

[Khasbulatov] My name was most likely known to many deputies earlier, specifically from my articles in the

press. I believe that the recommendation of the chairman helped also. And I was supported very actively by deputies from the autonomous regions. I perceived the support of deputies from the most diverse regions of the republic. In voting for me they were also, I believe, advocating new economic thinking.

[Kredov] When did you learn that you were being recommended for such a high office?

[Khasbulatov] Not long prior to the election. My name was put forward at a meeting of the conciliation commission. And, furthermore, my candidacy had been saved up for the contingency of a deadlock situation.

[Kredov] So your election was the result of compromise?

[Khasbulatov] To some extent, yes. I am not a member of "Democratic Russia" and have not aligned myself with either "left" or "right."

[Kredov] Your speech at the congress, quite sharp in content, pleased many deputies by its composure and coolness. Was this composure programmed and geared to the mood of the hall?

[Khasbulatov] No, I did not consider it possible for me to resort to tactical subterfuges. I candidly set forth my attitude toward the government program of transition to a market economy and criticized it quite sternly. At the same time, however, I expressed proposals which had been put forward before. The voting showed that the congress supported them.

I am opposed to a simplistic division of deputies into left and right, progressists and reactionaries. Each of us is a spokesman for a particular social tendency. Anyone speaking in this hall involuntarily sees the faces of his electorate. Today's society is very differentiated, and the congress reflects this situation. The crossing of contradictory views should not be taken to be dictated by opportunist considerations. Interests need to be reconciled. The creation at B.N. Yeltsin's suggestion of conciliation commissions is a step in this direction.

[Kredov] Nonetheless, Ruslan Imranovich, your election to the office of first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet has been evaluated by many people as a victory for B.N. Yeltsin—in the complex situation in which the congress found itself, in any event. Will you have an easy personal relationship?

[Khasbulatov] I am grateful to Boris Nikolayevich for his support. However, I do not believe that our personal relations will be cloudless. We will see.

Russian Party Initiative Congress Ends

LD1006205290 Moscow TASS in English 1819 GMT 10 Jun 90

[Text] Leningrad June 10 TASS—The Russian Communist Party on the platform of the CPSU ended its congress in Leningrad on Sunday.

The congress passed a political resolution declaring that the Russian Communist Party on the platform of the CPSU was being revived as a party of communist initiative, and offering alternative ways of transition to market relations in conditions of a deep economic and political crisis.

The congress elected candidates to the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party, discussed the tactics of Russian communists and advanced proposals to the drafts of the platform of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee to the 28th Congress and the party's Constitution.

Congress Difficulties Cited

LD1006204990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1216 GMT 10 Jun 90

[Excerpts] [Presenter Igor Zorin] In Mayak "Panorama" we are turning to a new topic, the party topic—viewed from an interesting angle. The second stage of the initiative congress of the future Russian Communist Party, CPSU, ends in Leningrad today. It opened yesterday. We are going to get some firsthand information about it. Mikhail Smirnov, a special correspondent for All-Union Radio, is there. Can you hear me?

[Smirnov] Yes, good day.

[Zorin] Go ahead.

[Smirnov] At the moment this initiative congress of the Russian Communist Party, CPSU—RCP for short—is holding elections for delegates to attend the all-Union conference of the RCP, which is expected to develop into an inaugural congress. The conference is scheduled to open on 19 June. RCP candidate members are being elected. I believe that discussion of the congress' political declaration has already begun. [passage omitted]

Today a guest from Moscow read out a resolution on the character of the party, which spoke in particular of the alliance of workers and peasants and advocated that we should return to that. But of the 89 full delegates to the congress—elected, incidentally, by a very complicated system—only 11 are workers and a mere four are peasants.

[Zorin] Declarations are one thing, but facts are something else.

[Smirnov] This same resolution calls for a planned economy and rejects the market. In other words, they want us to go back to domination by a multiplicity of ministries and committees. A delegate from Kuybyshev also denounced the market and the market economy, and read out a letter signed by a number of people, which he claimed was carefully worded. But he was cheating. Nowhere in this letter were the words, no to a market, to be found.

[Zorin] Maybe emotion is getting the upper hand over common sense.

[Smirnov] Unfortunately that is happening, I think, at the second stage of the initiative congress of the RCP. But, I repeat, the composition of the congress is not homogenous. I do not say this without reason. At the first stage...

[Zorin, interrupting] It is heterogeneous.

[Smirnov] Yes. It is not identical. So, it will be difficult for them to agree on anything. It is not without reason that the leaders of this initiative congress—in particular the Leningrad section, so to speak, of the RCP—want to defer everything, including the organization of the RCP, to the conference which will open on 19 June. But the congress itself is saying: No, we must get organized now. So, there is an argument about this.

[Zorin] I understand. Thank you, Mikhail.

More on Congress

PM1106115790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Jun 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report by correspondents V. Gerasimov, N. Volynskiy: "Strength in Unity"]

[Text] Leningrad—On this occasion the Leningraders' reputation for hospitality was not vindicated. Despite information published in VECHERNIY LENINGRAD, the newspaper of the Leningrad City Soviet, that there were enough vacancies in the city's hotels, participants in the second stage of the initiative congress of the Russian Communist Party within the CPSU who had arrived from all over Russia could not find any vacancies "as if to spite them."

Somehow they all managed to find a roof over their heads, however: Some stayed at plant hostels, others managed to get acquaintances to put them up. However, this was not the only surprise in store for them. In the morning, in order to get to the session, the congress participants had to fight their way through a mob of citizens, mainly juveniles, in a very aggressive mood.

It emerged from the Credentials Commission report that the congress participants represent 1,764,000 RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] communists. A big contingent. Naturally, they do not represent the whole republic. Therefore it is possible either to agree with their program for the rebirth of Russia, to criticize it, or to reject it. But it should be listened to calmly and without prejudice. Intolerance, as is known, is not the best method of arriving at the truth. What specific program, what way out of the political and economic crisis are the congress participants proposing for Russia? So far, in our opinion, their proposals, striking though they may be, are too declarative and vague. Work and more work is necessary on the program documents.

It is hardly likely that the extreme viewpoints will be reconciled at the present congress. However a quest for consensus and sensible compromises is the only way if the unity of the Russian Communist Party as a party consolidating healthy forces is to be preserved.

The congress adopted a political statement which asserts that the Russian Communist Party within the CPSU is being reborn as a party of communist initiative. Various options for an immediate transition to market relations in conditions of acute political and economic crisis were put forward.

The congress elected candidate members of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party within the CPSU, discussed the tactics for the activities of the republic's communists, and put forward proposals concerning the draft CPSU Central Committee Platform for the 28th CPSU Congress and the draft CPSU Statutes.

Russian Communist Party Idea Finds Support

LD0906021990 Moscow World Service in English 1100 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Text] The idea of having a Communist Party of Russia had found large-scale support during the election of delegates to the 28th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party. Many of the party organizations, and also the communists who received mandates to the congress, speak out for holding a party conference of Russia on the eve of the 28th Party Congress. It could consider the question of forming the Communist Party of Russia. This proposal was supported by the Leningrad party organization and then by the party organization in Chuvashiya, an autonomous republic in the Volga region. At the same time it says that the future Communist Party of Russia should remain within the Soviet Communist Party and should support the political platform proposed by the party's Central Committee for the 28th Party Congress.

Professor Urges Building of New Russian Party

PM0406155390 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 1 Jun 90 Single Edition p 5

[Article by Dr. of Philosophical Sciences Prof. V. Khalipov: "Dictated by the Logic of Life"]

[Text] "During our days the history of mankind is making one of the greatest, most difficult turns of immense significance—without the slightest exaggeration you could say— of world liberation significance." These words began V.I. Lenin's celebrated article "The Chief Task of Our Days," written at night on the train when the Soviet Government moved from Petrograd to Moscow and published at once in the newspaper IZVESTIYA VTsIK 12 March 1918.

The similarity of the historic significance of the turning point in the spring of 1990 enables us to recall those Leninist views. Today there is a possibility of resolving in a new way the questions of organizing sociopolitical life in the country and in Russia so as to resolve the task advanced by V.I. Lenin: to ensure at all costs that Russia ceases to be poverty-stricken and impotent.

This was the cherished thought of our party's founder and leader, the dream that he wanted to realize, and not just for the Russians but for the peoples of the whole country. Alas, it has to be admitted that we have not embodied it as fully as Lenin wanted. There are many reasons for this. But as regards the destiny of Russia itself, although it has become customary to curse the Communist Party for everything, it is now becoming increasingly clear that precisely the lack of their own powerful and influential republican organization of communists acted as a brake on the republic's development for the working people of Russia. If such a party had existed in Russia, it may have been possible in the past to forestall, curb, or at least soften the regime of Stalinism. If such a party existed, maybe today we would be taking a more sober look at life and not burdening ourselves with questionable hopes that a multiparty system and political pluralism will suddenly appear and things will turn out well almost of their own accord.

Of course, the question of the Communist Party in Russia is extremely complex. It is a developing question, and it cannot be resolved in the same way under different conditions. Traditional approaches still apply, or it would be better to say the traditional nonacceptance of the idea of a Communist Party in Russia. There are many reasons here. But there are two main ones. The first is the most serious and so, evidently, it is little mentioned. The majority of party members are concentrated in party organizations on the territory of Russia. They now make up more than half. Given this correlation, the creation of a Russian Communist Party will result in its Central Committee automatically becoming the possessor of the majority of party votes. And this means duocentrism, the possibility of the republic Central Committee disobeying the all-union Central Committee...

This was evidently precisely what the suspicious Stalin feared when he prevented the creation of such a Russian republican party organization. It seems that the creators of the CPSU Central Committee Bureau for the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] also proceeded from this premise during the times of Khrushchev. I believe that the decision of the CPSU Central Committee December (1989) Plenum "On the Formation of the CPSU Central Committee Russian Bureau" also took an important circumstance into account. The practice of Russia's oblast and kray party organizations being subordinate to the CPSU Central Committee has come down to our day from the times when the party's Central Committee decided and predetermined everything and is preserved practically in its former form.

The second aspect, which cannot be disregraded, is the presence in the RSFSR of many autonomous formations—republics, oblasts, and okrugs [national district]. There is a sum total of 32 of them out of the 53 that exist in the USSR. Sixteen ASSR's [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republics] have their own constitutions and their own Supreme Soviets and Councils of Ministers. Understandably, they stand a rank above the oblast and the kray. A number of them (the Bashkir and Tatar ASSR's) have a bigger population than some union republics. The creation of the Russian Communist Party and its Central Committee removes the party organizations of these republics from the CPSU Central Committee, as it were, and becomes for them a kind of intermediate tier, and a considerable one at that.

Hitherto it is precisely these circumstances that have outweighed all proposals in favor of an independent Russian Communist Party. But, precisely, hitherto. The abandonment of Article 6 of the USSR Constitution, the switch to political pluralism and to recognition of what is virtually a multiparty system, the introduction of presidential rule, and the major changes as a whole in the life of society enable us to look quite differently at the place and role of the CPSU and republic organizations in the life of society. It is certainly not obligatory to applaud these changes, but the reality of them has to be taken into account. They shift the party's role to a different plane and deprive it of the former comfort of power. And a place in the vanguard has to be merited, justified, and confirmed. At the present stage, with the abruptly changing view of so-called "democratic centralism," which had largely become a variety of bureaucratic centralism, the Stalinist principles of the party's rigidly centralized and militarized organization are disappearing from the party's life.

And these radical changes in our political life and its perestroyka at once advance very substantial arguments in favor of creating a Russian Communist Party. These changes—above all, those that are denoted in the draft CPSU Central Committee Platform, relating to the humanization and democratization of internal party life—require our party's "upper echelons" to be much more attentive and to treat with sympathy and understanding the desire of the broad masses of Russia's communists for unification.

The process of perestroyka has broadened and deepened—a beneficial, reassuring process. But it seems to me that it is already bursting its banks. For it turns out that not everything needs only to be restructured, but a very, very great deal must be built anew, to a high standard, for decades to come. And one of the first, new, chief construction sites here is not only a new economy, not only a new rule-of-law state, but also a new, Russian Communist Party.

RSFSR Writers Appeal to People, Deputies

PM0506115590 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 5 Jun 90 Single Edition p 4

[RSFSR Writers Union Board appeal to Russian people and deputies: "Writers' Appeal"—SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA headline]

[Text] Dear compatriots!

An hour of trials has come for our country, for the motherland.

The burden of past errors, augmented by the unsuccessful attempt to accelerate at a steep turn in perestroyka, have led to the verge of crisis. Disintegration threatens us in the economy and in social and political life. Interethnic conflicts, the very acute refugee problem, and massive attacks on the party, the army, and the pillars of socialism have become a reality.

Multinational Russia has found itself in a particularly grave situation.

For centuries great Russia has rallied and gathered the peoples. But today certain political forces grouped around the so-called "Democratic Russia" are leading to the split and division of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] into regional "individual principalities." The term "United States of Russia" has been adroitly put into play. Belittling Russia's contribution to the establishment of powerful outlying districts, speculating on national-patriotic feelings, seeking cover under pseudocritical demagogic phrases, the leaders of the forces are eager for power and reluctant to consider the fact that it is precisely in the RSFSR, which has solicitously offered its expanses for the erection of giant industrial projects on which the country's industrial and defense might rests, that an explosive economic, ecological, and social situation has now taken shape. Russian land and its peasants are exhausted, brought to the limit. Russia's natural resources and its spiritual and intellectual potential are being spent too generously for the sake of all-union advantage.

Russia's maternal self-sacrifice is known to the whole world.

The politics mongers and demagogues are purposefully sowing confusion among the peoples, ascribing "imperial ambitions" to the Russians. The culture of the Russian peoples is being subjected to tireless attacks. These same forces are imposing a stifling mass culture on us. A slanderous campaign against the best minds of Russia—writers, artists, figures of art and science, and people's deputies—is dealing merciless blows to our self-awareness.

It is quite hard for the Russian federation to oppose the coordinated, aggressive onslaught of internal and foreign "liquidators." The crisis of power has not bypassed it. The lack of Russian mass media enables the indecently bold radicals who have seized the press and television to deform public awareness and to destroy the people's moral and spiritual values.

We are experiencing with excitement all your successes and setbacks in the parliamentary field.

We welcome the ardent, united impulse with which you, our deputies, voted for Russian sovereignty. We expect from the Russian people's deputies wisdom and the manifestation of true concern for the people's welfare. Do not yield to the acts of provocation by individual arrogant politics mongers.

Russia does not need time-servers, leaders of scandalous repute seeking to grasp power. Russia needs firm, sensible, reliable leaders with a deep understanding of the tragedy of their own people. Only such leaders will find paths of conciliation and creation. They are among us. Promote them and defend them. Find paths to consensus with all forces which can defend Russia's interests.

Russia's interests and the aspirations and hopes of its numerous peoples rest with you deputies.

The peoples await the political independence of the RSFSR and its economic autonomy, authoritative organs of management, and Russian mass media. Russia needs its own Communist Party created before the 28th CPSU Congress.

Work with a thought for Russia!

Russia is with you!

[Signed] RSFSR Writers Union Board Secretariat.

Moscow Demonstrators Send Telegram to Gorbachev

LD0406155190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Text] At 0900 on 1 June, Child Protection Day, outside the building of the military procurator's office in Moscow, the Committee of Soldier's Mothers and the Union of Social Protection for Servicemen conducted actions against the use of force in relation to soldiers on emergency service. At 1100, at the Yelokhovskaya Church, there was a requiem for soldiers killed during their military service in peace time. In the evening at the Gorkiy Culture Park there was a rally.

The participants in the actions sent a telegram to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and to the Russian Soviet Federation Socialist Republic Congress of People's Deputies, which, on behalf of the mothers of the dead soldiers, demand to have data on the deaths of their sons. If this demand is not met, they intend to go on hunger strike.

Russian Youth Magazine To Promote 'Traditions'

PM0506093390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 2 Jun 90 First Edition p 4

[Report under the general heading "Meeting" and the rubric "Question-Answer": "Happy Birthday, ROSSIYA MOLODAYA!"—first two paragraphs are reader's letter]

[Text] Dear "Meeting"!

I have heard that a new periodical, ROSSIYA MOLODAYA, will shortly be coming out. Is this true? If it is, shouldn't you tell us about this periodical in more detail? The name is very attractive...
Senior Sergeant V. Rokotov

Yes, indeed, the new periodical ROSSIYA MOLODAYA has recently appeared in the kiosks," Sergey Yemelyanov, deputy chief editor, told us. "Maybe some readers know that there was a monthly called NECHERNOZEMYE. This was the forerunner of ROSSIYA MOLODAYA. The new periodical has a new status—that of a sociopolitical, popular-scientific, illustrated publication.

The new periodical is primarily geared toward Russia's young people. We do not divide the readers into those from the country and those from the towns: We want everyone to find us interesting. However, I am not hiding the fact that our main concern is the Russian land, and we intend to help in educating young farmers to be considerate toward nature, their native history, and popular traditions.

We also intend to publish materials about various events in culture, art, and literature. We will talk about popular methods of medical treatment and so on. We think that our publication may be useful to servicemen transferring to the reserve, not just on an informative or entertaining level but also as good assistance in resolving various everyday problems.

The price for an annual subscription to our periodical is six rubles [number of issues not stated]. The index is 73165.

The periodical's chief editor is Anatoliy Dmitriyev.

Moscow City, Oblast Refugee Problem Examined

LD0506213490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1650 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, 5 Jun—TASS correspondent Roman Grigoryev reports:

There are more than 10,000 refugees of different nationalities in Moscow and Moscow Oblast today. This was reported at the press conference which took place today and was held at the Moscow Soviet. The overwhelming majority of those who had to leave their permanent addresses are former inhabitants of Azerbajian. They left the republic after the tragic events which took place in Baku and other cities in January.

The statement of the Moscow Soviet commission on the problems of refugees issued at the press conference notes that the existing system of organizing help for the people who are in trouble is inefficient. False rumors to the effect that refugees are trying to settle in Moscow only are condemned as provocative.

Rauf Agayev, first secretary of Baku City Committee [gorkom] of the Communist Party of Azerbaijan, made a speech at the press conference, calling upon Russians who used to live in Baku to return to the city. According to him, six out of 11,000 Russians who left Azerbaijan's capital this year have already returned. They were provided with work and with places to live in. At the same time, according to the opinion of the gorkom first secretary, the "time has not yet come" for the return of Armenians to Baku.

The situation in Baku is normal now, Rauf Agayev said. In the city, whose population is 2 million; 270,000 Russians carry on working and living. Nevertheless, the situation is complicated by the presence of approximately 100,000 Azeris who had left Armenia. They are mainly agricultural workers, and it is difficult for them to obtain work and a place to live in the city.

A representative of the Moscow committee of Russian refugees from Baku noted that many Russians are afraid to return to Azerbaijan. "We are prepared to settle in any one of the Russian cities, however, not even one of those cities can provide us with places to live in at the present," he said.

The USSR Government undertook a number of measures some time ago to help refugees. They are receiving allowances; their rights concerning the receipt of compensation for their lost houses and property have been defined. The law on refugee status is being prepared in the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Leningrad 'Democratic Platform' Conference Held

PM0606110990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Jun 90 Morning Edition p3

[Report by own correspondent Yevgeniy Solomenko under rubric "Direct Line": "Proposals by Supporters of Democratic Platform"]

[Text] Leningrad—The second conference of Leningrad communists who support "The Democratic Platform in the CPSU" has been held.

The program statement they adopted affirms the priority of common human values over class interests, rejects a monopoly by any ideology, and proclaims a course of building democratic socialism within the framework of a parliamentary, multiparty state.

It also proclaims citizens' unconditional right to form parties and unions and the right to uncensored publishing activity, as well as the intention to bring the USSR Constitution and Soviet laws strictly into line with the Declaration of Human Rights.

At the same time the document envisions, in particular, abolishing party organizations in bodies of state authority and administration, the mass media, the Army, the Internal Affairs Ministry, the KGB, and other law enforcement bodies.

It also proposes to restore places of worship to believers, limit the functions of the KGB, subject the KGB, the Internal Affairs Ministry, and the Defense Ministry to effective monitoring by elected bodies of authority, to suggest that all republics hold a referendum on the question of their participation in the new Union treaty, to restore the rights of repressed peoples, and so forth....

In the economic sphere, it proposes to immediately form an efficient market sector and implement a complex of measures so as to alleviate the difficulties of the transitional period. It also envisions turning labor collectives into leaseholders to make them the real proprietors of their enterprises, ensuring equal rights for all forms of ownership, including private ownership, and forming a network of independent commercial banks. In agriculture, it proposes giving freedom to choose the method of running economic units and envisages legalizing the transfer of land for indefinite possession or for private ownership.

This document is being submitted to all CPSU members and non-party people for broad discussion.

The conference participants proposed that the 28th CPSU Congress agenda include the questions of the crisis in society and the party's responsibility, investigation of abuses of power and crimes by former communist leaders, and the party's program and name.

Kemerovo Oblast First Secretary Interviewed

PM0406130190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Jun 90 Second Edition p 3

[Interview with A.G. Melnikov, first secretary of Kemerovo Party Oblast Committee, by special correspondents V. Loktev and A. Skrypnik: "Cutting Edge: Kuzbass: Workers' Movement and Party Committees"; date of interview not stated; first three paragraphs are PRAVDA introduction]

[Text] One of the main factors which the party must consider in preparing for the congress is the broad scope of the workers movement and its politicization.

Last year's strike in the Kuzbass was an unprecedented event in all the years of Soviet power. This was the first time that hundreds of thousands of workers had resolutely opposed the administrative-edict system in a form so drastic and unaccustomed for us and had demonstrated the might of proletarian solidarity in support of perestroyka from below.

But despite the dialogue with the government and a number of specific measures which were adopted to fulfill the miners' demands, the situation in the region is complex to this day. What role are the oblast's communists playing today in these processes? PRAVDA's special correspondents talk about this with A.G. Melnikov, first secretary of the Kemerovo party obkom [oblast committee].

Kemerovo—[PRAVDA] Aleksandr Grigoryevich, you were recently reelected first secretary of the party obkom. We congratulate you.

[Melnikov] Thank you.

[PRAVDA] We know how complex the struggle for party power, so to speak, has been. We visited you in August last year and saw how hard it was for the party leader in the burning hot crucible of the strikes. Ten months have elapsed since then. They have been hard months. You did not regret starting to "fight for power" again?

[Melnikov] No. I want to be with the communists with whom I lived through those difficult 10 months. As for the situation in the oblast, unfortunately it remains complex and explosive. What are the reasons for this?

On the social plane, the shortage of food and industrial goods. Outside shipments are proceeding poorly. State reserves have eaten up everything. Further meat supplies are possible only as and when it arrives. Krasnodar, Voronezh, Lipetsk, Stavropol, and Tambov, which are better supplied than us, are disrupting deliveries. Our capacities for raising pigs and poultry and producing eggs are not being used because of the absence of feed. The Russian agro-industrial committee allocates equally to all—60-80 percent [of requirements]—irrespective of who has food and who does not.

The acquisition of meat products imported in exchange for coal has only just begun, because of the delay in issuing a licence.

On the economic plane the reasons for the conflict have not been eliminated, enterprises have not received genuine independence. The management structure has not been changed, only the labels have been altered. The omnipotence of the ministries remains. Moreover, it is absolutely intolerable that many of the mine's current issues have begun to be resolved in the USSR Council of Ministers right up to the chairman, bypassing the oblast and ministry.

This is leading to the overloading of the government and relieves the Ministry of the Coal Industry of responsibility for the consequences.

The resolution adopted on the socioeconomic development of the Kuzbass has not been backed up with allocated resources. The oblast's proposal for the centralization of supplies through the Main Administration of Material and Technical Supplies has done the rounds of the USSR Council of Ministers, the State Planning Committee, the State Committee for Material and Technical Supplies, and the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Council of ministers three times and always without result.

No decision has been taken on trading coal, nor on changing transaction [raschetnyye] prices. Coal is not being shipped out, it is burning [gorit].

There is impotence in the political field. The soviets have been reelected but the executive organs have not been formed and reelections are under way in the party organizations. Individual leaders of the Kuzbass union of working people and the workers committees and indeed frequently the press are performing destructive work against the party and soviet apparatus. Labor

discipline has declined and material and moral incentives have been weakened. Wages are not being exchanged for goods.

There is mounting dissatisfaction with the government and Supreme Soviet for their dilatoriness in taking decisions. There is much criticism of the CPSU Central Committee for ignoring the opinions of ordinary communists in the draft CPSU Platform and Statutes.

[PRAVDA] Is it possible that the already tense situation in the region may become more complicated?

[Melnikov] It is and, it seems to me, in two directions—the economic direction, unless the demands of the protocol against the bureaucracy of the ministry and government are met to the end. The events of July 1989 were turned toward the local organs, the party, and the soviets. Now these reasons have been eliminated—the Ministry of the Coal Industry and the central departments will be responsible.

On the political plane it may become more complex through the inflammatory method in the period before the Russian party conference and the 28th CPSU Congress as a means of bringing pressure to bear. I see no other reasons.

The overwhelming majority of working people are against strikes. The peasants are indignant—they are threatening to take steps. But the most dangerous thing is if young people are drawn into the strikes or meetings. They may be attracted by the slogans of the radicals, and pretexts will be found.

[PRAVDA] Your personal attitude as a communist toward the CPSU Central Committee Platform?

[Melnikov] The platform itself is constructive and comprehensible and provides an opportunity for the gradual solution of the tasks of boosting the economy and renewing society and the party. The party remains a working party.

The democratic platform indulges in more slander and does not propose vigorous work to improve the situation. The rest consists of attractive little parliamentary tricks which destroy the party.

I disagree in principle:

—with the rejection of democratic centralism;

—with the deideologization of the KGB, the Ministry of Internal Affairs, and the army... That is a fetish;

—with the elimination of rayon committees;

—with the authorization of factionalsm.

My opinion is that the whole party should improve the CPSU Central Committee Platform and direct debate toward this.

[PRAVDA] Today a lot is being said about a possible split in the party. What can you say on this subject?

[Melnikov] The communists are enormously anxious about the possibility of a split. But they hope the congress will not allow this. If a split does occur then there will be no party. Two weak parliamentary wings will wage a struggle, opening up an opportunity for other political forces to grow stronger.

[PRAVDA] A congress of the union of working people of the country was held in Novokuznetsk recently and adopted its own program and statutes. What is your opinion?

[Melnikov] As is well known, everything began with the union of working people of the Kuzbass. In general this regional union is not legally registered and does not enjoy popularity among the workers. Deproletarianized elements and people trying to gain political capital most frequently join it. That is why the union's leaders often operate by incorrect methods with regard to the party and the official organs. For the time being they are succeeding in winning popularity by this means but I do not think they will be successful.

The workers' committees do not want to merge with the union as that would deprive them of the opportunity to control the protocol and to dictate by threatening to strike.

The union's movement toward politicization under radical slogans is dangerous. Its statute makes it possible to rapidly register as a party with a social composition identical to the CPSU.

"Our newspaper," the organ of the union of Kuzbass working people, enjoys popularity today, but it will not survive long in that form. Its authors have too low an opinion of their readers and that is noticeable and people are beginning to understand it.

[PRAVDA] During our tour of the oblast we heard a lot about how the people pin great hopes on regional economic accountability [khozraschet]. What do you think about that?

[Melnikov] Regional economic accountability without a market economy is impossible in the Kuzbass. The oblast's independence must be increased in all respects. Everything which the oblast produces in sufficient quantities should be on the store shelves.

Several of the region's oblasts, for instance the Kuzbass, Altay, Tomsk, Novosibirsk, and Omsk could meet their own needs for everything with minimal shipment requirements. All the excess could be shipped outside the region. Such regional integration on a long-term basis will make it possible to increase production volumes more rapidly and to remove social tension.

[PRAVDA] This probably applies to a great degree to supplying the population with food. And here there is the question of the state of the oblast's agriculture.

[Melnikov] Yes, on this sector of the front, so to speak, we have few victories. Some 30 percent of the total volume of capital investments are invested in the country's agriculture. In the Kuzbass the figure is 12 percent. A protracted lag has accumulated in rural development. Over 20 years 300 villages have been destroyed and the rural population has declined. Some 60,000 hectares of land have been taken for coal mining. They have not been restored.

Insufficient equipment and material resources are being earmarked. It's a joke: one tractor a year per state farm. Each agricultural worker has to feed 32 mouths (in the RSFSR the figure is 10 and in the country as a whole it is eight) and there is 0.5 hectares of arable land per person.

Nonetheless the oblast supplies itself in full with potatoes and vegetables and with 70 percent of the meat and milk it needs. From one hectare of arable and agricultural land we produce more output than our neighbors. It is true that hothouse farming is lagging behind: There are 50 hectares allocated to this sort of farming yet according to the norm there should be at least 300.

We should not reassure ourselves with illusions, for it is clear that with any form of production relations and ownership the Kuzbass will not be able to feed itself in the next few years. We need to be supplied with an additional 100,000 tonnes of meat, 500,000 tonnes of dairy produce, and 700,000 tonnes of concentrated feed in exchange, naturally, for coal, metal, and chemical output. Our neighbors in the Altay and Omsk Oblast have these resources, what is needed is long-term integration, not the allocation of stocks and resources via Moscow every year.

[PRAVDA] And a last question: How do you see the renewed CPSU?

[Melnikov] The party must regain authority among the workers and working people and express their interests more clearly and defend them. It must strengthen ideological and organizational unity and party discipline, struggle for the minds of the younger generation, and return the press to the party organs. Under the conditions of the multiparty system this is particularly important.

We must purge the party of those who are shaming it and are unworthy of being communists not for ideological but rather for moral reasons.

We should not believe that the provincial "vantage point" is lower than Moscow's. The view from below is the view of the masses. Below there is the practice of life, there is no theory with a consideration of this practice.

We should trust the rayons more with the management of the economy and all social life.

And, of course, we must raise the role of the Central Committee as an organ of collective leadership. Workers simply must be brought into the Politburo or Presidium.

CPSU's Baklanov Visits Kemerovo Oblast

PM0406153590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Jun 90 Second Edition p 2

[Text] Baklanov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, stayed in Kemerovo Oblast 27 May-2 June. As everyone knows, a complex sociopolitical situation has formed here—it has been brought about by a high degree of politicization of the population, and by the discontent of miners' collectives with the slow fulfillment of government decisions.

The many conversations held by the secretary of the CPSU Central Committee with miner-metallurgists and representatives of the labor collectives of other industries, his meeting with communists and activists of works, mines, and towns both in Novokuznetsk and Kemerovo trenchantly discussed the present situation in the economy and the party.

At the center of attention were issues concerning the transition to a regulated market economy, the news of which has been received by inhabitants of the industrial area with suspicion. At meetings with Kuzbass workers it was stressed that the party regards concern for man as being of paramount importance; that is why local party organizations must be very thoughtful about painstakingly working out questions of the market in order to ensure that everyone understands and knows what awaits them and when—above all in the resolution of social and everyday questions.

Baklanov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, took part in the second stage of the Kemerovo oblast report-back electoral conference which ratified the results of the election of delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress, discussed the draft platform of the CPSU Central Committee for the 28th congress and the CPSU draft statute, and worked out the concept of the activity and the structure of the CPSU oblast party committee and of the control and auditing commission.

Siberian Oil Workers To Reduce Supplies

LD1106160190 Moscow TASS in English 1541 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 11 TASS—"The work collective council of the Soviet Union's largest oil producing organisation Nizhnevartovskneftegaz (Siberia) has decided to reduce the supply of the rawstuff by 10,000 tonnes daily for severel days," the newspaper IZVESTIYA reported today.

The matter is that eight out of twelve points, on which the USSR Council of Ministers firmly promised to take radical measures, have not been fulfilled, the newspaper writes, which prompted oilmen of Nizhnevartovsk to take action in reply. This decision by Samotlor oilmen has been resolutely supported by all oil producing organisations of Tyumen region, although oil is supplied uninterruptedly from there so far.

On June 12 representatives of Siberian oilmen are expected to meet the leadership of the USSR Council of Ministers. A general conference of delegates from all work collectives of oilmen of the region is scheduled for June 15.

The oilmen's protracted dispute with the government will be, most probably, summed up at the conference, IZVESTIYA points out.

Sverdlovsk Oblast First Secretary Resigns

90UN2016A Moscow TRUD in Russian 5 Jun 90 p 1

[Article by TRUD staff correspondent A. Dzhapakov, Sverdlovsk: "An Unexpected Resignation"]

[Text] Without exaggeration, the statement by A. Gusev, first secretary of the CPSU Sverdlovsk Obkom [oblast committee], which was heard on the second day of the 26th Oblast Party Conference, was like a bomb being dropped: Having worked for less that two months as first secretary, A. Gusev suddenly resigned voluntarily.

Actually, this was the second stage of the conference; the first was held in April. At that point A. Gusev was elected first secretary altogether unexpectedly not only for the communists of the oblast but also for Aleksandr Petrovich Gusev himself, who at the time worked as first secretary of the Asbest City Committee of the party. His name was not on the list of candidate leaders of the oblast party organization. The proposal to elect him came up spontaneously during the conference itself.

A. Gusev said at the time that he was prepared to withdraw his candidacy, but if the conference considered it essential to elect him he would obey its decision. A. Gusev was exactly the one to get the most votes among four candidates, one of whom was the then second secretary of the party obkom, V. Manyukhin. Gusev, a candidate of technical sciences who used to be a department chief in a large scientific research institute, was relatively new to party work. This was one of the main reasons for his election—the conference believed that he was the least affected by all the negative things which the party is now vigorously getting rid of.

Suddenly, his resignation came.... In his petition A. Gusev outlined in detail the motives that prompted him to make this unconventional decision: After starting the work he understood that he does not possess all the qualities and talents that the leader of a party organization as large and powerful as that of Sverdlovsk Oblast needs. Numerous meetings with labor collectives and communists of the oblast compel the obkom first secretary to search for answers to the most complex issues of the day.

Here is the result of these considerations. A. Gusev said in his petition: "I am reporting to you now frankly and honestly that I do not understand how to work in the old pattern, along the vertical line [of command]. On the other hand, in the environment of a multiparty system, when all power is transferred to the soviets, I do not see major political, party methods that may be used efficiently to solve serious social and economic programs."

A. Gusev also referred to the fact that it may be dishonorable to withdraw from party work right now, at the most difficult time. However, his opinion is that it is still better to leave if one does not see any inner potential for creative work.... He said: "Believe me, it was difficult, painful, and far from easy for me to take this step. However, I find the image of a man hanging on to power by his teeth equally objectionable...."

Well, at present the situation in the party is indeed very complex. The communists' evaluation of A. Gusev's action is mixed, but a majority of them agree that this was an honest deed. The man did not look for reasons for his action in "the intrigues of the apparatus," or in someone's interference. On the contrary, he stressed specifically that there was no pressure on him on the part of the apparatus, and that he made his decision independently, having interpreted the situation responsibly and in a balanced manner.

The conference accepted A. Gusev's resignation. A plenum of the party obkom held straight away resolved to elect Obkom Second Secretary V. Kadochnikov as first secretary. Incidentally, this proposal was also made in his statement by Gusev himself. V. Kadochnikov was elected first secretary of the Sverdlovsk Party Obkom.

Kaluga Votes To Cut Meat Deliveries to Moscow

PM0406154990 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 1 Jun 90 Single Edition p 5

[Unidentified TASS correspondent report: "Decision Adopted"]

[Text] Kaluga, 31 May—A resolution reducing as of 1 June this year deliveries of meat and dairy products to Union republic stocks in the form of shipments to Moscow has been adopted by the oblast soviet executive committee. The well known decision of the Moscow City Soviet has forced measures to be taken to increase allocations of these products for local supply.

Khabarovsk Kray Party Conference Takes Recess

PM0506094390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Jun 90 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report under the rubric "Official" and the general heading: "Conferences Held"]

[Text] Khabarovsk, 3 Jun—The first stage in the work of Khabarovsk Kray Party Conference has ended. In discussing the draft CPSU Central Committee Platform for the 28th Party Congress and the draft CPSU Statutes, the communists of the Amur region noted with alarm the exacerbation of the sociopolitical and economic situation in the kray, the decline in the kray party organization's authority, and the indecisiveness and tardiness in

restructuring party work. However, few specific proposals aimed at surmounting the crisis and strengthening the broad masses' confidence in the party were submitted.

The election of the CPSU kray committee first secretary was inconclusive. One of the most popular aspirants to this post—V.M. Krysin, general director of the Soviet-Korean "Eksman" enterprise—gained the largest number of votes after the first round of a secret ballot but unexpectedly withdrew before the second round. The delegates spent two days on a discussion of the business-like, political, and moral qualities of five other aspirants and on a secret ballot. However, no one secured the confidence of the majority, and the post of first secretary was left vacant.

The conference examined the makeup of 28th CPSU Congress delegates from the kray party organization. They include 16 party officials and just two workers.

It was decided to continue the work of the conference after the congress.

Kursk First Secretary Views 28th Congress

90UN1973A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
30 May 90 Second Edition p 3

[Report on interview with A.I. Seleznev, first secretary of the Kursk Oblast CPSU Committee, by PRAVDA special correspondent Yu. Makhrin; place and date not specified: "Time to Rally Forces"]

[Text] "What will we come to the 28th Congress with?" This question is asked most often at present at the conferences and meetings being held in the Kursk Oblast party organizations. Alarm over the future of the CPSU and the country is in the hearts of many communists.

What do they think about ways to renew their party?

This is the topic of a conversation between a special PRAVDA correspondent and A.I. Seleznev, first secretary of the Kursk Oblast CPSU Committee.

[Makhrin] Aleksandr Ivanovich, I know that the organizational department of the obkom [oblast committee of the party] summarizes opinions and proposals made at city and rayon party conferences. You have attended some of them. Tell us about the main flows, so to speak, of collective thought of the Communists of Kursk.

[Seleznev] First of all, they are convinced that the eve of the congress is the time to rally healthy forces. This is the time for every... I wanted to say in a customary manner "every communist." No, it is the time for everyone who has a party membership card to finally determine his position. The time has come to make a choice. We cannot endlessly debate and consult; it is time to work out the strategy of the party and get going.

Resolutions adopted by the communists contain a clear-cut and firm position: loyalty to the socialist idea and the duty of the political vanguard of workers and peasants.

The people have come to understand who is who in the CPSU and other organizations. They see that certain people began with slogans in support of perestroyka, later switched to pressuring the party, and now they know only one word: "Down with!" "Creeping counter-revolution"—this is how the people of Kursk refer to the forces leeching off democracy and glasnost. This may be somewhat too sharp. However, many people believe that the danger posed by these forces should not be underestimated.

There is also this opinion: Pluralism is fine, but the party should come to its congress with a program which would incorporate, as one of the speakers put it, all "the grains of gold" in the reflections of communists. Let me give you quotations from the minutes: "Just over a month remains until our main forum. We may arrive at its opening with everybody being after his own thing," "We cannot go to the congress disunited, separately, with a conglomerate of ideas..."

The communists say that there can be no unity with the Afanasyevs. Indeed, they have left the CPSU, but like-minded people remain. Could it be that their only reason is to try and split the congress and the party?

[Makhrin] In Manturovskiy Rayon, an individual has left the party who received his party membership card in a trench, before a battle. The front-line veteran told his fellow villagers who knew him as a true party member: "The party of Lenin has been betrayed."

[Seleznev] I think that these words spoken by a front-line veteran are not justified. We can understand this man. However, he is not the only one to think so.

The struggle for removing the CPSU from the political arena has reached its zenith: Even the name of Lenin has not been spared. The ideals dear to the hearts and minds of Soviet people were energetically uncrowned. Some authors ridiculed the entire 70-year path of our country. The history of our party was strewn with tragic markers and represented as a chain of mistakes and failures. Didn't all of us see it? We did, but many of us kept silent. This is why many dedicated communists lost heart. I think that their departure from the CPSU is the greatest loss and a rebuke to all of us party members.

In the opinion of my comrades, whose points of view I also subscribe to, the history of the CPSU needs to be reexamined anew at the congress, in depth and honestly. An answer finally should be given: Whose party is the CPSU? I think that the severance of the socialist idea from the interests of social groups supportive of it has given rise to the concept of "the party of the entire people," and the congress will have to say whose interests the CPSU is going to protect.

Incidentally, the communists believe that the five years of perestroyka should be evaluated in an equally unbiased manner. After all, this is a lot of time! Mistakes have been made. As it were, we should also analyze their roots.

[Makhrin] Which mistakes are meant?

[Seleznev] Many communists of Kursk think that the 19th Party Conference is the main landmark in the life of the party. There was a flare-up, an outburst, if you will, of the innermost ideas in the course of unusually productive and constructive discussions. At that time, the CPSU ship caught a mighty wind in its sails. Surprisingly, it did not move ahead, as could be expected, but lingered at the starting line: We kept rechecking the compass and charting a more precise course. In a word, we were overcautious. Meanwhile, various small boats of our opponents, including quite frail ones, picked up steam.

The Central Committee did not support in a timely manner the communists' sincere gust of renewal, it made no move toward the party mass which has opened up its soul for a dialogue. Of course, as they say, the old methods of work held them back by the lapels. However, something else was essential: Various measures, especially those in the soviets, were a major distraction. Second-rate, rather than main tasks, frequently ended up in their field of vision.

Indeed, it was very difficult at the Central Committee. However, we know from the history of the CPSU that during difficult, fateful times the leadership consulted party members. Let us recall that congresses were convened every year rather than once in five years.

[Makhrin] Therefore, we cannot go to the congress disunited. To your mind, what avenues for the unification of healthy forces are the communists aware of?

[Seleznev] Resolutions adopted by the party conferences on the whole support the draft platform and statute, despite many substantive critical remarks being made, especially about the platform. It is rebuked for being declarative, for its most important provisions being fuzzy and contradictory. The main objectives of the party and ways and means for achieving them are defined weakly and dimly. The concept of modern socialism is also quite hazy, as if the document had been written simultaneously by various people. Perhaps the draft platform itself should have said clearly what the Central Committee later had to say in the open letter to the communists.

It is common knowledge that any congress is prepared. It is another matter how it is prepared. It is not the point for 5,000 delegates to greet, as was the case previously, every idea from the podium with stormy, continuous applause which does not die down and grows into an ovation... Organization and order are necessary in the course of preparations for the congress. Preparations for the congress have been under way. To be sure, for a long time the ray of glasnost did not illuminate it. A commission was set up but, alas, too late. However, the communists as well learned only recently about its operation. Based on initial reports, one could conclude that the remarks of party members mainly touch on the language and style of the documents published. I doubt that their style is of particular concern to the communists. I have already said that they criticize the very essence of, say, the platform.

The very sense of preparatory work for the congress is to sum up opinions from the lower echelons, to detect the entire spectrum, common, similar, and different points of view, and to compare them openly and publicly in the press, perhaps, in special information bulletins. This would definitely promote the integration of many ideas and proposals.

There is the opinion that the commission should not just work itself, but should set up sections and working groups with the participation of communists who have sent in the most interesting proposals. Preparations for the congress cannot proceed in the calm of offices. The party of scientific communism has a duty to study, select, and bring to fruition the ideas of the masses. Only in this case will it be able to play its vanguard role rather than be a parliamentary-type party.

The communists are also awaiting other draft documents which will to some degree set the tone for the proceedings of the congress. The people are comprehending the role of the party in the environment of political pluralism. They are particularly concerned about the problem of the party and the economy. It is clear that the party organizations cannot work the old way. However, we cannot abandon resolving economic issues and withdraw either.

The events of recent days have made the communists wary. Ours is the ruling party, the people have entrusted to it the future of the motherland. However, fundamental issues—those of ownership and of land—were considered without any participation or even consultation with, say, the rural organizations of the party. Later, they are called upon to implement this policy, and they ask for a good reason: "You left us on the sidelines, out of the process of making these decisions. What can you ask of us? We are not cogs in the machine!"

[Makhrin] Do the communists give standing instructions to candidate delegates to the congress at their party conferences?

[Seleznev] There are many standing instructions. Here are some examples. The influx of fresh forces to the party apparatus should proceed more vigorously. In the 1980's intelligent, energetic people have advanced. Nonetheless, certain pillars of the apparatus are preserved here and there, ostensibly for ensuring cadre continuity—they have been working for decades. Incidentally, this happens in the Central Committee as well. I know a comrade who came there for the first time in 1953.

One more instruction is: Do not vote for elderly people in elections to the Central Committee. Communist Bolotov, a people's deputy of Russia, said at a meeting: "In the villages, they make sure that matches are kept hidden from 70-year-old oldsters, as well as from children." Many people remember that Brezhnev was complimented in the Kremlin during a ceremony for receiving yet another decoration: "It is good that in our country being 70 is being middle-aged." People who have deserved retirement should finally be granted it.

Perhaps the most frequent instruction to the delegates is: The congress should develop a reliable mechanism ensuring the power of the party mass. Specifically, there are proposals for the primary organizations to delegate some of their powers to the upper echelons rather than the other way around.

The opinion of the communists of Kursk on how the 28th Congress should proceed also merits attention. Not only the plenary sessions but those of sections are also necessary: the party and the economy, ideology, intraparty work...

As we recall, previously show visits to the labor collectives of Moscow were arranged for the delegates of congresses. Of course, this is obsolete. However, maybe we should interrupt the congress once the drafts of the most significant decisions are submitted in order for participants to go back to their party organizations to consult with the communists who have elected them?

A heated discussion on the powers of delegates to the congress is flaring up. There is a point of view, which was stated on the Discussion Page of PRAVDA as well, and which calls for the deputy credentials to be valid for all of the coming five years. As I see it, this will belittle and even paralyze the operation of the elected organs of the party and leaders. The congress will set forth the strategy of the CPSU and will form the Central Committee. Let those in whom they place their confidence work and be personally responsible to the party. If there are doubts about whether we are being led in the right direction, an extraordinary congress can be convened.

Many people are wary of proposals on the structure of the CPSU leadership. The composition and functions of the Presidium actually set it against the Central Committee. At the same time, the composition of the Presidium is such that it will not be easy to even convene it. Its members should work in the leading organs of the USSR Supreme Soviet, in the republic party and soviet organs. This is fraught with two consequences: First, a complete loss of timeliness in the work of the Central Committee, the disconnection of its commissions, and a gap between the Central Committee and the lower party organizations. Second, conditions are created for command-administrative actions on the part of the chairman and his deputies, whom the Central Committee of the party will actually be unable to monitor. I believe that it is impermissible and unfortunate for the party of Lenin to pile up some kind of "deputy" positions. What do we need them for? In essence, we need the first or general secretary or chairman of the Central Committee. A second secretary is necessary here, but by no means a deputy.

[Makhrin] What is the attitude of the communists of Kursk, including your own, toward the concept of creating the Russian Communist Party?

[Seleznev] Indeed, this idea has now taken over the minds of the people, despite the frequently stated apprehension that a block such as the Russian Communist Party will diminish the role of the communist parties of other republics.

In a number of locations they are already trying to begin independently the formation of another party. However, as is known, the Russian Party Conference is being prepared, at which it is going to be resolved whether the Russian Communist Party is to be or not to be. All those who wish Russia well should strive for constructive cooperation and work together with the CPSU Central Committee and the Russian Bureau rather than be given over to a dream to outmaneuver somebody. What is the main point in this matter? It is to have everything serve the rallying of forces for the renaissance of Russia, because there are many people willing to make statements which result in isolating the republic and weakening its role in the new federation. The communists cannot support a trend toward splitting the USSR.

INSTEAD OF AN AFTERWORD. During my trip to Kursk Oblast, I also talked to the participants in the Manturovskiy Rayon party conference. A lot of their pronouncements were consonant with what the obkom first secretary said. All of them noted the particular responsibility of delegates to the 28th Congress. Chairman of the "Spark" collective farm Yu. Borozdin said: "They should feel party members who have placed confidence in them breathing down their necks over there, in Moscow, and should remember their firm position when they vote: Yes to democracy, no to anti-Leninism and anarchy." Well, these were correct and good parting words!

Balakovo Protests Against Nuclear Power Station

PM0606081390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 2 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast: V. Ryazanov report]

[Text] [Announcer] Civic movements in Balakovo City, Saratov Oblast, have launched a protest action against the continuing operation of existing power units and the building of new ones at Balakovo nuclear power station [AES].

[Ryazanov—video shows marchers carrying protest banners] Approximately 1,500 persons formed from early morning a human chain along various sections of the city streets and highways leading to Balakovo AES.

[Laboratory Technician G.G. Bochkareva speaking to camera] Our children have developed both blood diseases and allergies.

[Ryazanov—video shows banner-carrying demonstrators] People are alarmed and indignant; despite repeated appeals to the union and republic leaderships and the USSR Ministry of Nuclear Power Generation and the Nuclear Industry, a powerful AES is still operating and being expanded here on the banks of the Volga, right next to the city. As for the situation on 1 June [video shows a window display of "Radiation Conditions at the AES Industrial Site," external shots of power station, power line pylons, technician at instrument panel]: The radiation level recorded by instruments is not in excess of background radiation values. Only one of the three operational power units—each one of which has a capacity of 1 million kilowatts—was actually in operation.

We were told that the rather frequent shutdowns of power units—the Balakovo AES ranks first in the sector in terms of the number of shutdowns—were due to the poor quality of Soviet-made power industry equipment. There have been no failures by the nuclear reactor. Specialists are convinced that safe operations by the AES are reliably guaranteed. [video shows unidentified man seated at desk, showing an item of equipment to the reporter] They are ready to meet citizens' representatives at any time and answer all the questions perturbing them. What will you tell people?

[B.S. Samoylov, chief engineer at Balakovo AES, talking to camera] Only the truth and trustworthy information about the power station's operations.

[Ryazanov—video shows agitated demonstrators talking] The city residents were unwilling to hear the AES spokesman out. This is the price to be paid for the years of silence and secrecy which shrouded operations by this and other nuclear power stations in the country—loss of confidence, waste of efforts; something else is also alarming.

[Yu.M. Bugrov, chairman of Balakovo City Soviet] We are waiting for someone to arrive—we don't know who, we don't from from where, we don't know for what purpose. Unfortunately, even the deputies themselves who organized this action are simply not keeping us informed.

[Ryazanov—video shows people outside official building, a group of citizens at discussion around a table, outside shots of Balakovo] It is proposed to hold a citywide ecology rally in Balakovo 24 June. An action group has been set up to organize it. It appears that Balakovo's citizens are beginning to realize that no constructive result will be achieved by disjointed efforts and by remaining hostage to soapbox passions.

Tomsk Oblast Elects New First Secretary

PM0606141190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Jun 90 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Oblast Conference"]

[Text] Tomsk, 4 Jun—The first phase of the oblast party conference has ended here. Its participants discussed reports presented by the CPSU oblast committee [obkom] and the auditing commission, along with the CPSU Central Committee draft platform for the 28th Party Congress and the draft CPSU Statute.

A.A. Pomorov, hitherto an obkom secretary, was elected party obkom first secretary.

The conference will close after the 28th CPSU Congress.

Vorkuta Miners Still Considering General Strike

LD0906180190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 9 Jun 90

[Video report by correspondent Ye. Kuznetsov in Vorkuta—from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] And now we return to a subject that has been frequently raised in Vremya—the position of the miners, their relationship with allied workers, and the demands for social changes. Unfortunately, the well-known decision of the USSR Council of Ministers on these issues is not being fully implemented, and this is once again threatening to lead to a strike in the pits of the Pechora coal basin.

[Kuznetsov] June, and the last day of the snow is melting in Vorkuta. The general strike declared by the conference of Vorkuta workers draws ever closer. The miners have leveled serious complaints against the railwaymen for failing to ship out the coal they have mined: more than one million tonnes of coal have accumulated in the mine depots, which means - so runs the miners' thinking—our output is not needed, or else the government does not know just how much the country needs the fuel from the Arctic. Unwinding the spiral of complaints (?from the empty railcars), they have not forgotten the progress in implementing decision No. 608, or a number of demands of a political nature. All this amounts to a summer offensive by the working people for their rights—no more and no less.

Concern for the fate of their output and thereby for economic prosperity was reinforced when serious talk began on the imminent introduction of market relations—nobody wants to be in a fix because of failures at the center. Since April, under threat of a strike, the railwaymen have managed to ship out more than half of the stockpiled coal, but this has yet to stop the momentum of the strike preparations. After all, empty sidings and mountains of rotting fuel are still a common picture. [video cuts to interview with V.V. Kopasov, identified in caption as council first deputy chairman; and with V.I. Tukan, identified in caption as deputy

chairman of the City Workers' Committee and member of the Organizational Committee of the Miners' Congress—Kuznetsov first addresses Kopasov] Is the strike planned for 1 July being taken off the agenda?

[Kopasov] No, it is not, because there is still a very large amount of coal in Vorkuta—around 50,000 tonnes—and unfortunately the accident rate is growing and people are (?ruining) their lives and sustaining injuries for no reason whatsoever.

[Tukan] The issue remains open, because on 11 June in Donetsk there will be a miners' congress, and at that congress the issue will be fully resolved across the entire ministry—the issue of a general strike. [video shows coal stocks, railway trucks, interviews with miners]

Volgograd Consumer Council Raises Food Prices

LD0406215190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 4 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Presenter] The Volgograd Oblast consumer council has made an attempt to raise prices for some foodstuffs that are sold in cooperative shops. Our correspondent reports on what has emerged from this.

[Begin recording] [Correspndent Orlov, identified by caption] While the country is being torn apart, alive with discussions and various kinds of rumors in connection with the transition to market relations and the impending increase in retail prices, cooperative workers in Volgograd decided to jump ahead of events. Referring to the fact that rural residents had refused to hand cattle over to procurement officials on the former conditions, finding it more advantageous to sell to collective and state farms and on the black market in general, and seeing that expenditure for the acquisition of produce had thereby increased, the Volgograd consumer council altered the prices for it in its own shops. Thus, for example, beef—which used to cost R3.50 per kg—began to be sold at R6; the price of cooked sausage increased to R7, and that of semi-smoked sausage to R12 per kg.

It is understandable that these measures evoked a very definite attitude on the part of the population. Calls poured in to the editorial offices of the local papers and to the offices of the oblast leaders. But the people who were worried by this turn did not yet know that the issue of raising prices in cooperative trade had already been agreed, not with anyone, but with the party oblast committee. It's interesting that the executive committee of the oblast soviet, which had utterly failed to look into the situation, did not raise any objections either. And the people's deputies themselves found out about the price rises only when they turned up at the shop counters along with the other shoppers. Evidently the slogan "All Power to the Soviets" is for some people still just a slogan. But not for all. The oblast people's control committee intervened urgently and decisively in the matter of trade.

[B.F. Pylin, USSR people's deputy, chairman of the People's Control Committee, indentified by caption] We have put this situation right already. The point is that the Volgograd consumer council does not just procure meat from the population but also obtains a significant amount in addition from state resources, at the state price. So they should have taken account of the aggregate and arrived at a calculated average price, not the one that was in the shops. It was therefore recommended that prices should be reviewed, and Volgograders have already felt this change. Prices for beef and for sausage have been reduced.

[Orlov] Meanwhile meetings have started again in Volgograd. People are asking the question point-blank at them: Have the oblast soviet and its deputies taken power into their hands or not? [end recording]

[Presenter] Well, the people of Volgograd have put the question very precisely. We would also like to ask local authorities how they encouraged such illegality while the country's parliament has spoken so many times about preliminary consultation with the people? [video shows street scenes, shop interiors, official buildings, Pylin to camera, public meeting where Russian imperial flags are visible]

Western Republics

New Moldavian Premier Interviewed on Tasks

LD0906212590

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 0800 GMT on 9 June broadcasts as part of its "Soyuz" program a link-up with the Kishinev studio to talk to a local radio correspondent and Nircha Druk, the new prime minister of Moldavia and "incidentally, I think, the first nonparty premier in Kishinev, at least since the war." Following the introductions and a summary of Druk's career so far, he is asked to describe his priorities. Druk replies:

"Our priority is the economic sovereignty of the republic, de jure and de facto, economic sovereignty and political sovereignty. The formation of the government is fairly difficult, but we are not in any particular hurry. But the labor market is rather small for us to assemble and form a new team, but gradually we...and we are facing resistance: each collective farm and each small grouping wants its man to be put forward as a minister or for a higher position. In other words, subjectivism is inherent, it is present, but we are trying to get out of this situation somehow."

The next question concerns the economic policies which Druk will pursue with his cabinet. He answers:

"Above all, we need a program and measures to protect certain sectors. We have to solve the questions, not only of what to produce, but also of what we do not need to produce. We have to elaborate a catalogue and list of output which it might be sensible to suspend and not

continue producing, which is not in demand or causes damage to people and to society as a whole, both ecologically and in other senses.

"But as for the primary priorities, I can enumerate them. Moldavia can withstand competition, stabilize its economy and achieve certain progress if we receive from Moscow the right to acquire the status of a free zone or porto franco, as an investment zone for capital and to attract foreign capital. Second, the priorities are, above all, agriculture as a source of raw material for the food industry, light industry and the pharmaceutical industry, building materials and the cosmetics industry, cosmetics. That is what we must start with. We need to process expensive raw materials, of which we are wasting up to 40 percent. If we do not do this, there is no point in talking about economic reform and the transition to a market economy.

"So, Moscow has to give us the right to liberalize imports slightly. We do not want to import consumer goods, but highly modern processing technology, for processing and producing foodstuffs, for, first, we have to feed people; secondly, we have to clothe people; and we have to give them the opportunity to build themselves a nest, so we need building materials; then we also have to guarantee people's health, so we need to develop the pharmaceutical industry; and we have to have everything that is necessary for our women to be beautiful, so we need cosmetics. We have the raw materials for all this, an enormous quantity of raw materials, and they are being wasted. That is a crime.

"The second factor or hope is the other thing in which our republic is rich: gray matter. We have a human factor and potential, and it has never been used for its proper purpose. That is also a crime."

The presenter does not pursue any of these points, but rounds off by wishing Druk success and looking forward to more reports on his progress.

New Situation in Moldavia Reported

LD1006203890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 10 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Correspondent G. Klimov, identified by screen caption] Kishinev is living a normal life, although not everything is as before. There is more concern in faces and there are more rumors. They are doing their own thing—noticeboards are full with pages of proposals on exhanges between Kishinev and towns in Russia and the Ukraine. The Russian-speaking population comprises half the population of Kishinev. What is driving people from the places familiar to them? Strained inter-ethnic relations and lack of confidence in the fast diffusion of tension. The Supreme Soviet of the republic of Moldavia noted in its address that conservative forces are attempting to discredit the movement for national revival in resorting to intimidation of the population, and are attempting to separate Moldavians and representatives of other nationalities into different sides. The earnestly whipped-up ideas about Moldavia's secession from the USSR and its annexation to Romania have been declared groundless. There is now an interval in the work of the parliament. What is being discussed here in the center of the city, ceaselessly, from morning to evening? Possibly, the formation of the new government. Half the cabinet has been approved by parliamentarians. All of them are Moldavians, although there were also candidates of other nationalities. It is not in vain that the expression mononational government has been put into use today. What will its practical actions be, under the shadow of the new tricolor flag? The future will show. An improvement in the general climate in the republic depends to a great extent on the sociopolitical organizations and movements. [video shows street scenes]

[O.G. Nantoy, member of the People's Front Council, identified by screen caption] It is important now that people do not lose that core which is called democratic methods, parliamentary methods, and the priority of nonviolation of human rights, so that this is not a slogan but really is actual policy. Things are moving in such a way as to create examples in society of the constructive solution of accumulated problems, and social formations already in existence or newly created political parties may take this on themselves. A process of renunciation should be in progress, because we need to cetegorically renounce policies of confrontation, naturally without waiving one's principles.

Russians in Moldavia Ignore Language Law

LD1106224790

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2057 GMT on 11 June broadcasts its "Television News Service" program, which includes a report from Moldavia by correspondent G. Klimov on the fact that the Russian-speaking population on the west bank of the Dnestr—in Bendery, Tiraspol, and other towns—are ignoring the law on a state language and the state flag of Moldova passed by the Moldavian Supreme Soviet. Russians interviewed complain that they may not be given jobs because they do not speak Moldavian, and that there is a feeling of enmity toward them.

The video shows street scenes and man-on-the-street interviews.

Moldavia's Victims of Stalinism Form Association

LD1006032490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1535 GMT 9 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Anatoliy Golya]

[Text] Kishinev, 9 June (TASS)—The purpose of the Association of Victims of Repression in Moldavia is to unite innocent people who suffered from the repressions that lasted from the 1930s to the 1950s. The inaugural meeting of this association was held here today. It was

attended by over 500 delegates, representing all the towns and districts of the republic, as well as a number of villages in Chernovtsy and Odessa Oblasts of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

During the years of Stalin's arbitrary rule, about 100,000 people were deported from Moldavia. Hundreds of people were shot. Last year the republic's government adopted a decision rehabilitating the victims and instituting the payment of compensation to them and to their families for the property, which was confiscated during that period.

The participants in the inaugural assembly discussed and adopted the basic draft of the association's charter. A coordinating committee was elected; it has been given the task of preparing the association's first congress, which will take place on 6 July 1990.

Thatcher Visits Kiev Exhibitions in Ukraine

LD0906184490 Moscow TASS in English 1658 GMT 9 Jun 90

[By TASS special correspondents]

[Text] Kiev June 9 TASS—The residents of the capital of the Ukraine today gave a warm welcome to British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher who is currently in the Soviet Union on a working visit. She arrived in Kiev to attend the Britain festival in the USSR.

From the airport the distinguished British guest headed for the Urkainian Exhibition of National Economic Achievements, the site of the major landmarks of the British festival—British industry today and present-day life of Britain exhibitions. The first of them displays products of 30 firms and companies and the other shows how British people live, work and rest.

After touring the exhibitions, Mrs. Thatcher attended a ceremony of signing an agreement to found a joint Soviet-British firm for the gas and chemical complex at Novyy Urengoy (Western Siberia) and of signing of documents on cooperation between the Ukrainian agencies and British firms in the agro-sector and the establishment of the joint pharmaceutical enterprise Anglomed.

The British prime minister also visited other facilities of the Britain festival. She viewed British high-definition TV equipment, and exhibitions of British books and fashions.

Mrs. Thatcher presented scholarships to ten young Ukrainian scientists who will go to Britain for research work.

The central event of the British prime minister's stay in Kiev was her speech to the Ukraine parliament deputies in the afternoon. In her remarks Mrs. Thatcher noted the importance of democratic processes taking place in Soviet society and wished people's deputies fruitful work.

During the sightseeing tour of the city Mrs. Thatcher made a stop in October Revolution Square in downtown Kiev, came out of the car and talked with Kiev residents.

Paying tribute to the memory of Soviet people who died during World War Two, she laid a wreath at the Unknown Soldier's tomb in the Park of the Eternal glory, and laid flowers at the monument to Soviet people and Soviet army soldiers and officers taken prisoner by the Nazis and shot to death in Babiy Yar.

In the evening she attended the "Xerxes" performance by English National Opera singers.

Mrs. Thatcher leaves by air for Leninakan, Armenia, on Sunday.

Ivashko Meets Ukraine Komsomol Congress Delegates

LD1006184890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 10 Jun 90

[Text] The 26th Congress of the Ukraine LKSM [Komsomol] began work today in Kiev. On the eve of its opening, Ivashko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine, and chairman of the republican Supreme Soviet, met delegates.

Conference on Ukrainian Diaspora Ends 11 Jun

LD1106105790 Moscow TASS in English 1046 GMT 11 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Pelekh]

[Text] Kiev June 11 TASS—A scientific conference devoted to the roots and contemporary life of the Ukrainian diaspora abroad has ended its work in Chernovtsiy, western Ukraine. It was sponsored by the regional cultural-educational "Oberig" society and held within the framework of the forthcoming centenary of progressive Ukrainian emigration, which will be observed in many countries in 1991 on UNESCO's decision.

Scientific workers from Chernovtsiy University, the local branch of the Institute of Social Problems of Foreign States under the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, and also representatives of scientific and public organisations of Canada, Poland and Romania, where many Ukrainians have settled, delivered reports on the reasons and consequences of massive Ukrainian migrations, particularly from its western regions, on their desire to strengthen relations with the homeland, to preserve and develop their language, literature and art.

The conference noted that perestroika processes in the Soviet Union and changes in East Europe's political life have created favourable conditions for the growth of national self-awareness, activation of the Ukrainian diaspora's political life. They called for stronger business relations and comprehensive cooperation with it.

Miners Congress Opens in Donetsk 11 Jun

LD1106133990 Moscow TASS in English 1325 GMT 11 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondents Anatoliy Gordeyev and Vladimir Yurkevich]

[Text] Donetsk June 11 TASS—Social position of miners in the USSR is discussed at a congress of Soviet miners which opened today in Donetsk, the Ukraine. The congress is attended by representatives of most of coal-mining areas of the USSR. Officials of the Soviet coal mining industry's ministry, of the Central Council of the Trade Union of the Mining Industry, people's deputies of the USSR and union republics, were invited to the congress.

A news conference was held prior to the congress. It was noted that not all miners have the same attitude to the congress. A number of strike committees that had earlier supported the decision of the 15th Congress of the Union of Coal Miners to conduct a similar forum in August of this year in Moscow, boycotted the congress in Donetsk.

The congress is to discuss such important problems for the industry as the implementation of the Soviet Government's resolution adopted during last year's summer strikes and the transition of the coal industry to the market economy.

The congress is also to discuss the possibility of creating an independent mining union.

Ukrainian Nuclear Power Plant Picketed

AU0906131290 Paris AFP in English 0941 GMT 9 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, June 9 (AFP)—About 300 residents of Nikopol have crossed a water reservoir on motorboats and ferries to picket the Ukrainian Zaporozhye [spelling as received] nuclear power plant which they want closed, INTERFAX, a semi-independent news agency reported here Saturday. The protest was organised by local deputies and Greenpeace activists, who want a special government commission to carry out health checks around the plant, in the southern Ukraine, INTERFAX said.

Transcarpathia To Switch to European Mean Time

LD1106120890 Kiev International Service in Ukrainian 1700 GMT 10 Jun 90

[Text] A prolonged campaign in Transcarpathian oblast to change over to European Mean Time has ended. The extraordinary session of the oblast soviet decided that during the night of 1-2 September a new way of counting hours will be introduced in Transcarpathian oblast, to keep up with the first time zone. This means that the oblast will go over to traditional European Mean Time which is two hours behind Moscow time. However, the switch to summer and winter time, as being practiced in the country, will be preserved.

Oblast Soviet Stops Radar Station Construction

LD1106225990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2057 GMT 11 Jun 90

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] As we have already reported, on the demands of the residents of Transcarpathia, the oblast soviet has adopted a bold decision. It has by its authority prohibited the construction of a powerful radar station in the settlement of (Pistryalevo). In the opinion of specialists, its operation may pose a danger to the population and the environment.

[Correspondent V. Lyashko, identified by screen caption] The first thing that the local authorities did was to put a militia guard on the radar station construction site. The round-the-clock duty details have instructions to inspect all vehicles heading for the station, to stop delivery of construction materials or equipment. By their decision the oblast soviet of people's deputies proposed that the Ministry of Defense withdraw the military builders from the project and carry out recultivation of the lands destroyed in the area of the station. It is probably the first time in our lives that a body of local authority has adopted such a cetegorical decision regarding the activity of a military department. Therefore I asked the chairman of the oblast soviet of people's deputies what the soviet will do if the Ministry of Defense refuses to observe its decision.

[N. Yu. Voloshchuk, chairman of oblast soviet, identified by screen caption] Seven hundred thousand working people of the oblast have signed a petition that a Carpathian facility should not be on this site. I think that our politicians are very reasonable and shrewd, and it is hardly likely that they will agree to that. Well then, if they do go against the will of the people, then the people will have their say as well. [video shows landscapes, police checkpoint and Voloshchuk being interviewed]

Caucasus

General Calls for Disarming Armenian 'Bandits'

NC0806112390 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 0440 GMT 6 Jun 90

[From the republican press review]

[Text] The newspapers today published an interview with USSR People's Deputy Army General Nikolay Ivanonich Popov by AZERINFORM's correspondent Guseynov. The interview was based on the incidents in the Transcaucasus, particularly on the dispute between Armenia and Azerbaijan. The Army general noted that the Armenian bandits have been carrying out bloody massacres in the region and said that he supports the adoption of resolute measures to put an end to this state of affairs. He asserted that the Armenian bandits must be disarmed without delay.

We recommend that you read the interview.

Russian Refugees Disavow Armenian Nationalists

NC0806114390 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 0440 GMT 5 Jun 90

[From the republican press review]

[Text] The permanent mission of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Council of Ministers to the USSR Council of Ministers has received a telegram from the Committee of Russian Refugees. The telegram, which was published by the press, said:

The Armenian refugees have been trying continuously since January 1990 to convince us, the Russian refugees, to participate in their joint activities aimed at acquiring residential quarters in Moscow, Moscow Oblast, and cities in the central regions of the Soviet Union. We, the members of the Committee of Russian Refugees, uphold our right to live in our historic homeland. In view of the affiliation of the Armenian refugees' headquarters with the Armenian SSR, we do not wish to participate in the effort made by the Armenian nationalists to realize their plans. We believe that certain forces in the Armenian SSR are to blame for the outbreak of the dispute in the Transcaucasus and for the disruption of stability in the region.

We do not want the creation of new problems similar to the Nagorno-Karabakh problem in the Soviet Union. The committee has been assigned to make it known that the Russian refugees will not cooperate with the Armenian nationalists, neither at the present time nor in the future.

New Armenian Komsomol Paper Published

LD0606083690 Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian 23 May 90 p 4

[Summary] The first issue of a new paper called ANDRADARTS, which is published jointly by the Armenian Komsomol Central Committee and the Armenian Union of Journalists, has appeared in the republic. "Readers will be interested to know that the material reflected in the new papers may or may not coincide with the official view of its publishers."

New First Secretary Elected for Megrinskiy Rayon

NC0706095890 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0500 GMT 7 Jun 90

[From the review of KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN]

[Text] The paper has published a report on the plenum of the Megrinskiy rayon party committee. The plenum discussed organizational matters. It relieved Megrabyan of his post of first secretary of the rayon party committee in connection with his transfer to other work. By a secret ballot the plenum elected Arutyunyan, from among other candidates, to be first secretary of the Megrinskiy rayon party committee. Until his election Arutyunyan occupied the post of chairman of the Megrinskiy Rayon Soviet Executive Committee of People's Deputies.

Confusion Reported in Second Armenian Elections

NC0606122090 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0500 GMT 6 Jun 90

[From the review of KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN]

[Text] Journalist Sarkis Mkhitaryan has written an article under the title "The Price of Silence." [passage indistinct] Commenting on the fact that it was as late as 2 and 3 June that radio, television, and the mass media announced the day of the repeat elections set for Sunday, 3 June, the journalist says that thousands of voters did not have time to find out whether repeat elections were to take place in their okrugs. Now, as a direct result of this silence, a far more grave situation has developed [not further specified]. The main blame falls on the central and okrug electoral commissions whose duty it was to organize the elections.

Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet Session Detailed

NC1206080790 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1730 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] The Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] held its regular meeting on 11 June. R. Agayev, El'mira Kafarova, Afrand Dashdamirov, Sahip Alekperov, Fuad Musayev, F. Muradaliyev, Tel'man Orudzhev, Viktor Polyankichko, [name indistinct] Rizayeva, Gasan Gasanov, and V. Guseynov and the members of the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and Council of Ministers were on the podium. El'mira Kafarova, chairwoman of the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet, opened the meeting.

The only item on the agenda was the approval of the declaration of a state of emergency in Azerbaijan SSR's rayons which have common borders with the Armenian SSR.

Internal Affairs Minister Mukhammad Asadov briefed the convocation on the declaration. This was followed by speeches. The Supreme Soviet approved a draft decision in principle and assigned a group of deputies to revise this document in the light of the proposals presented during the meeting. The decision will be published in the press.

State of Emergency Prposed

LD1106202790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] A session of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet opened in Baku today. It examined a question on introducing a state of emergency in the rayons bordering Armenia. As is known, for a long time now guerrillas from the so-called Armenian National Army have been systematically subjecting the Azerbaijani settlements to fire attacks, including bombardment. About a month ago the Azerbaijan leadership suggested to the Armenian Government to declare a 10 km strip along both sides of the border and to remove all illegal armed units, and thus help to achieve a peaceful

situation in this region. However, the Armenian side did not agree. For the defense of the interests of the peaceful population in the Azerbaijani areas bordering Armenia, the deputies made a number of suggestions, one of which is to introduce a state of emergency in this zone, but the session has not yet adopted a resolution on this question. A special commission of deputies has been set up which will examine all the suggestions and then submit its findings on this question to the Supreme Soviet.

Minister Arrives in Baku To Discuss Railways

NC1106104790 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1730 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Text] USSR Minister of Railways Nikolay Konarev has arrived in Baku to participate in the work of the 32d Azerbaijan Communist Party Congress and assist in the organization of work in the Azerbaijan railways network. In a statement to AZERINFORM, he said that the situation on railway tracks in the Transcaucasus is normalizing despite the interruptions.

Konarev added: Thanks to the measures that have been put into effect, railway transportation links between the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] and the Armenian SSR have been restored. As a result, it has been possible to maintain stability in the transportation of goods in either direction and in the region as a whole for the past three months. Tens of thousands of freight cars carrying provisions, construction materials, assembled units, and industrial and agricultural goods were able to reach their destinations. The new leaders of Azerbaijan have made a significant contribution toward achieving this. However, the recent incidents in the capital of the Armenian SSR, including the attack on the military personnel who escorted the passenger train from Kafan to Yerevan, does not allow us to say that the transportation situation has been fully normalized. Nevertheless, the Azerbaijani railway workers are (?fulfilling their) tasks without shortcomings.

Konarev continued: I am convinced of this and I repeatedly underlined in my speeches to the USSR Supreme Soviet and the USSR Council of Ministers and in my statements to the media that a number of forces are disrupting movement on the tracks. They are trying to obstruct the smooth operation of the railways in the two republics. The well-planned provocations by Armenian terrorists have caused damage. Freight cars have been destroyed and a [word indistinct] was fired on in the sector of the Azerbaijan railways network which lies in Armenia's Megrinskiy Rayon.

Replying to your question on the credibility of what railway workers in Yerevan told the central mass media in connection with the (?destruction) and theft of goods on the Azerbaijan railway tracks, I wish to say that what has been said in that regard is unfounded. [passage indistinct]

Furthermore, the USSR Ministry of Railways, working with the government of Azerbaijan, has drawn up a long-term program to improve railway transportation. In accordance with this program, locomotives will be [word indistinct] and the capacity of the freight handling centers and [words indistinct] throughout the republic will be upgraded.

Georgian Paper Reports Independence Day Events

LD1106140890 Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 27 May 90 pp 1,4

[By Georgiy Nadareishvili, Aleksey Sinel'nikov, and Tamaz Lomsadze]

[Excerpts] May 26 turned out marvelously sunny in Tbilisi. And from the early hours of the morning the day had a holiday atmosphere about it. There were brightly colored banners and thousands of people came out on the streets of the city to mark a holiday which is sacred to all of us—Georgian state independence restoration day.

At midday Rustaveli Avenue was closed to traffic. A meeting organized by serveral parties and public organizations, which had just gathered in the coordinating center of the National Liberation Movement, began on the very spot where Georgian cadets died for the freedom of their homeland and where blood was shed very recently, in April last year. The meeting was opened by Georgiy Tvalavadze, a representative of the Georgian National Democratic Party. There were many speeches, but in essence they all boiled down to the same thing: May 26 is not simply a historic date for us. It is freedom won and lost. It is confidence in the creation of a truly democratic Republic of Georgia. [passage omitted]

In Tskhinvali, there was an attempt to hold a joint meeting by the Osetian and Georgian public. Slogans about friendship between the Osetian and Georgian peoples were chanted and a banner reading "Long Live Independent Georiga!" fluttered over the meeting. But the course of events at the meeting was not to the liking of some. A leaflet entitled "Z Gamsakhurdia's Interview With the Italian Press" was distributed. The question at the meeting found it insulting and in the end the meeting had to be stopped. It continued in the village of Tamarasheni under the banner "Samachablo, an Inseparable Part of Georgia".

It seemed that everything possible had been done to prevent provocations and disturbances in Abkhazia in the run-up to 26 May. Just before that day the presidium of the autonomous republic's Supreme Soviet took a decision that no meetings and demonstrations were to be held in the centre of Sukhumi. It was recommended that festive demonstrations should be organized in labor collectives. But a meeting nonetheless took place in the republic's stadium. There were armored personnel carriers on nearly every corner, and units of Ministry of Internal Affairs troops patrolled the roads of the republic in anticipation of the end of the meeting. Valdas Talomka of Sajudis, among others, addressed the meeting. He brought greetings to the Georgian people

from the Lithuanian people on the occasion of independence day, the national holiday.

The situation became heated in Gagra. An authorized meeting was planned at the stadium there. But it did not take place. Agents provocateurs throwing stones were waiting at the gates of the stadium for people as they arrived. Bottles and lumps of metal were also thrown. Warning shots were fired as units of Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic Internal Affairs Ministry troops began an operation to separate the hostile factions. The meeting was wrecked. A short time later representatives of socio-political movements and members of the public from Gagra gathered outside the city party committee. Condemning the provocation, they demanded the resignation of Valeriy Piliy, first secretary of the committee. Their main reason was "the inability of the committee leadership to guarantee the necesary order in the town and to protect citizens from the threat of encroachments on their honor and dignity."

The first secretary addressed those at the meeting and promised that order would be restored and the culprits severely punished. Meanwhile a group of about 100 people occupied Gagra town executive committee and refused to leave....

In the meantime Georgian Internal Affairs Ministry experts and investigators have arrived in Gagra to investigate the fire at the Konstantine Gamsakhurdai Museum. It has already been established that the fire broke out in three places at once, and that the criminals broke in on the second floor using a ladder. In Sukhumi, representatives of Aydgilara, the Abkhazian Popular Front, have again categorically denied that this organization was involved in the provocation and have condemned it.

The tension that arose on 26 May in certain parts of the republic was, unfortunately, predictable. To a large degree it could have been diffused if there had been official recognition of independence day as a public holiday.

Georgia's Abkhaz Forum Demands Leaders Resign

LD1106144690 Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 29 May 90 p 3

[By Aleksey Sinel'nikov]

[Text] On the initiative of Aydgilara—the Abkhaz People's Forum—there has been a meeting of people of Abkhaz towns and rayons at the state philharmonic theater in Sukhumi.

The meeting adopted an appeal to the government of the autonomous republic which we cite below in full. It reveals the intentions of the Abkhaz opposition leaders and perhaps helps to predict future developments in the republic.

"Socioeconomic and political problems have been building up for several years in the Abkhaz Autonomous Republic. The former leadership evaded seeking a solution to pressing problems and this destabilized society. A new government was appointed to rectify the situation in the republic without consulting the people, in other words using the old administrative-command method. It failed to exercise its authority. The result was the tragic events of 15 and 16 July 1989. In the name of the peace of the population of Abkhazia and the peoples of the autonomous republic we demand the resignation of the current leadership which has no political prestige in society and is split along national lines. We further demand the election by democratic means of a new Soviet and party leadership in the autonomous republic. Any delay in resolving this issue in conditions of interethnic tension and the serious economic situation in Abkhazia is fraught with the same consequences as were seen in July last year. The deadline by which the conditions of this appeal are to be met is 4 June. If the demands in this appeal are not met then we shall begin a civil disobedience campaign."

Sergey Shamba, leader of Aydgilara, noted that rumors that the meeting was aimed at disrupting Independence Day celebrations in Abkhazia were groundless. The decisions of the meeting of representatives, he said, are without national overtones and are purely political. At present, he continued, we are maintaining contact with Georgian opposition organizations in Abkhazia. It is perfectly possible that they will support the demands laid out in our appeal.

—Do your actions have the consent of the Coordinating Center of the National Forum in whose congress Aydgilara took part?

—No, our actions have not received their consent and the coordinating centre was not informed of them in advance.

Central Asia

Continuing Reportage on Disorder in Kirghizia

Situation at Uzbekistan Border

LD1106163390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 11 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] Alarming reports from Kirghizia are, even today, overshadowing other kinds of information from Central Asia. The main thing at present, probably, is to find and eliminate the causes of the outbreak of the disorders. Here are our correspondents:

[Unidentified correspondent] It is a day of mourning today, Monday, in Osh and the adjacent regions. Over the last 24 hours the tendency toward normalization of the situation in Osh, the oblast center, and in the

majority of the rayons of the oblast, has been maintained, which is even now raising the possibility of a more sensible approach to the causes of the tragedy which has erupted.

Desperate unemployment: In Osh Oblast alone there are more than 37,000 young people who cannot find an outlet for their energies. The housing problem has simply become a recurrent theme: People can wait for housing for 15 years. And as a consequence of the extremely low standard of living, there is an absence of political culture which leads to protests in barbarous forms. The results are lamentable. [video shows scenes from Osh, people walking in the streets, buying newspapers] [passage omitted]

[Second unidentified correspondent] What is the situation in rural areas? Our film crew sets off for the border with Uzbekistan. [video shows armed militia at border point, people standing and talking] On the other side of the temporary post is Uzbekistan, Andizhan oblast. Unfortunately, it is very unusual to see such barriers on the roads of this abundent, hospitable area. But, I understand, it was necessary to restrain human fury and feelings of vengeance. The situation is normal today in all of the five border rayons and in Andizhan itself. Passions have subsided. But the agitation and confusion on the faces of these people stems from the fact that some of them still don't know the fate of some of the Uzbek stockraisers and beekeepers who had been working on the pastures in the mountains of Kirghizia. There are still a lot of rumors here; there is little information. There is pain, there is anger. Yes, the wounds of interethnic strife take a long time to heal. And I know how quickly the flames of passion can flare up and how difficult it is to douse them. [video cuts to interview with Sh.R. Mirsaidov, chairman of the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic Council of Ministers—identified by caption]

[Begin Mirsaidov recording] With the assistance of all the activists, party, local soviet activists; with the assistance of our elders and veterans; with the assistance of the clergy, women's councils—literally absolutely everyone with whom we work—and of course, one must not belittle the role of our law enforcement organs here; with their assistance, too, we are now managing to restrain emotions and stabilize the situation. [end recording]

Poverty Blamed for Disorder

LD1106162790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Excerpts] Heated passions are not abating in Kirghizia. Our own and TASS correspondents report on the conflict in the republic. [passage omitted]

Chingiz Aytmatov, member of the country's Presidential Council, has arrived in the Republic and met many of his fellow countrymen. Together with him a group of Uzbek writers have come to Kirghizia. The authority of these people and the words spoken during the many meetings with collective farm workers and students, we hope, have caused many to stop and think and understand that bloody murder will never be a solution to the conflict.

Listen to this interview by our special correspondent Vladimir Perfiliyev with Chingiz Aytmatov.

[Begin Aytmatov recording] So this is my second day here. I am trying to understand everything. I must say in answer to your question—what is the reason—the reason is, anyway, the same for many peoples of our suffering country. It is the extremely low living standard. Poverty, and poverty causes, so to speak—poverty connected to a low level of culture as a whole. Unemployment: now we have to talk about this out loud. Despairing unemployment—hundreds and thousands of young people do not have a place of work, place where they could put to use their strength and capabilities.

The housing problem: well that's what everyone talks about, but here it has come to the surface in precisely this way. And the housing problem here is maybe (?decisive) in the sense that here there is absolutely nowhere to live, especially for young workers and students.

And the reason for such an explosion of mutual hatred in general, it seems to me, is insignificant, I would say useless: a field of only 23 hectares—this became the point of contention. On the one hand, therefore, [word indistinct] obviously they intended, without thinking it through as they should have done, to hand out plots for building houses. On the other hand, this land was needed by the peasants living there. This field feeds these peasants. This must be understood as well. And instead of solving this conflict sensibly they called meetings and at these meetings—you know what is happening now.

And there are extremist forces. Without a doubt they exist. I do not know if the bodies of law and order are able to investigate them and uncover them, but they literally...I am convinced, more than convinced, that they exist. They have stirred up these passions and what we are now seeing is an extreme (?form) of nationalism. This is no longer nationalism—it is mutual hate, you understand. And this is all the more tragic because the Kirghiz and Uzbek peoples have lived on this land for centuries and we have never known, on the whole, such conflicts; we have never ever heard about them. [passage omitted] Only reason can help solve this situation. People should not listen to rumors. The people are already calming down. In the end, reason will prevail. [end recording]

Regions' Prime Ministers Meet

AU1206071090 Paris AFP in English 0633 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, June 12 (AFP)—The prime ministers of Kirghizia and Uzbekistan met in Osh on their border Monday following interethnic violence in the region in

which 139 have died and nearly 500 have been injured, local journalists reported from the area Tuesday.

Kirghizia's Apas Dzhumagulov and Uzbekistan's Shukurula Mirsaidov met with other officials from the two republics' border region.

The Kirghiz delegation promised strong measures against those responsible for the killings and those officials who were unable to prevent the violence, which started just over a week ago in Osh in the wake of a dispute over building land.

Mr. Mirsaidov expressed concern for the safety of Uzbek shepherds in the Osh region. Some 1,000 had crossed back into Uzbekistan, but another 1,500 were still unaccounted for, he was quoted as saying.

He also criticized "extremist" demands by some Uzbeks who have called for the creation of autonomous Uzbek regions within Kirghizia, saying his government would oppose this.

Situation Reportedly 'Stabilizing'

LD1206075590 Moscow TASS in English 0738 GMT 12 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Boris Mainaev]

[Text] Frunze June 12 TASS—A total of 139 people have been killed and 486 wounded in ethnic clashes between Kirghiz and Uzbek people in the Osh region since June 4, according to the Kirghiz Interior Ministry.

However, the situation is stabilising. Local residents are staging rallies to discuss ways out of the crisis.

Kirghiz Prime Minister Apas Dzhumagulov said on local television that the government has allocated large sums of money to restore buildings destroyed in the rampage.

All houses will be rebuilt within a few months if life returns to normal, he said.

On June 9, Dzhumagulov met Uzbek Prime Minister Shukurulla Mirsaidov in Osh region. The two leaders expressed condolences to families of dead Kirghizs and Uzbeks. The culprits will be severely prosecuted, they said.

About a thousand Uzbek cattle breeders whose herds grazed in Kirghizia have returned to Uzbekistan.

Frunze was calm on Monday, with only one clash at night, when a group of youths pelted a militia patrol with stones and bottles despite a nighttime curfew. Several were detained and authorities are investigating the incident.

Death Toll Reported at 139

LD1206072190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0707 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Excerpt] Frunze, 12 June (TASS)—TASS correspondent Boris Maynayev reports:

According to Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic Ministry of Internal Affairs figures, the death toll so far in Osh Oblast, where there have been clashes between Kirghiz and Uzbeks since 4 June, has reached 139 and 486 people have been injured. Nonetheless the situation is stabilizing. [passage omitted]

Sydykov Elected Chairman of Osh Oblast Soviet

LD1106085390 Frunze SOVETSKAYA KIRGHIZIYA in Russian 25 May 90 p 2

[Summary] A session of the Osh Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies has elected U Sydykov, already first secretary of Osh CPSU Oblast Committee, as chairman of the oblast soviet.

Kazakh Communist Party Holds 17th Congress

Republic's Sovereignty Discussed

LD0906195690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 9 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The 17th Congress of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan ended in Alma-Ata today.

[Correspondent D.Baimbetov—identified by caption] For three days the delegates held a frank and honest discussion of the future of Kazakhstan's party organization—1,852 members have left in the past month alone—and of the economic and sociopolitical situation in the republic. For the first time, taking into account the specific features of the Kazakh SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic], an independent Kazakh Communist Party platform has been adopted.

One of the central issues on the agenda was the republic's political and economic sovereignty. In this connection there was discussion of legislative reinforcement of Kazakhstan's status as a sovereign state, building its relations with the union and the republics on a contractual basis. For this, the republic's soil, subsoil, and resources must belong to it alone.

And of course the communists, representing a party organization with more than 840,000 members, could not fail to be disturbed by inter-ethnic relations. Among the numerous decisions taken, I would single out the congress resolution on the closure of the Semipalatinsk nuclear test ground and its conversion for civilian use.

On the final day of the congress, the members of the Central Committee and Auditing Commission of the Kazakh Communist Party were elected, and for the first

time it was decided to rename the Central Committe bureau as the politburo, which more clearly expresses the essence of the renewed party as a political organization.

Comrade Nazarbayev was reelected first secretary of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee in a secret ballot. [video shows congress in session; Nazarbayev standing to an ovation]

Gorbachev Candidature Recommended

LD0906215190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 9 Jun 90

[Excerpts] Today the 17th Congress of the Kazakh Communist Party has finished. [passage omitted]

The Congress has recommended to the 28th CPSU Congress the candidature of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev for election as general secretary and member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee.

Declarations for unity within the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the on the Semipalatinsk nuclear testing ground have been adopted. The delegates highly rated political stablity in the republic. Girenko, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, participated in the work of the congress.

People's Deputy Delegation Visits Semipalatinsk

LD0906222290 Moscow TASS in English 1630 GMT 9 Jun 90

[By TASS special correspondent Yuriy Rublevskiy]

[Text] Kurchatov (Semipalatinsk region, eastern Kazakhstan) June 9 TASS—A groups [as received] of Soviet parliamentarians led by People's Deputy Nikolay Petrushenko arrived in the neighborhood of the Semipalatinsk nuclear testing ground today to familiarize themselves with its operation and probe into what caused unrest in the neighbouring regions.

The deputies are accompanied on their trip by representatives of some federal ministries and specialists who carry equipment needed to assess on-site ecological parameters in the testing ground and adjacent residential areas. The first test showed that the radiation background in the testing ground did not exceed federal standards.

The central nuclear testing grounds were established in Kazakhstan in 1947. The first atomic weapon test was held on August 29, 1949. There have been no tests here since October 1989. Nevertheless, residents of adjacent regions, including activists of the Semipalatinsk-Nevada Movement, insist on its complete shut-down.

6 Jun Flood Damage in Tadzhik SSR Noted

LD0906053390 Dushanbe Domestic Service in Tajik 1000 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Text] Today we have received this report from Komsomolabad settlement. On the night of 6 June of the current year heavy rain fell in the settlement. As a result of flooding in Tegerme village, five people, including four children, were killed and power lines were destroyed.

Early in the morning, a commission was set up by the settlement's executive committee. After a few minutes, aid was dispatch to help the victims. A governmental commission headed by Vecelkov, second secretary of the Tajikistan Communist Party Central Committee, in the composition of Zatsarinnyy, deputy chairman of the republican Council of Ministers, and Gafarov, minister of rural construction, also arrived in the area from Dushanbe.

Work is continuing to determine the amount of damage caused, the results will be then referred to the governmental commission. Now it has been determined that 205 farms, 21 residential houses, four pieces of farm machinery, two private cars, state property and bridges in the villages of Hakimi (?Polazi), (Qala Nard), Tutkhvar, and (?Sangsalek) have been damaged. A number of cattle have been killed and many orchards and fields have been destroyed.

According to preliminary reports, the damage caused by the natural disaster amounts to more than R2 million. All victims have been accounted for and will be given assistance.

Saudi Clergy Discuss Ties With Uzbek Muslims

LD1006205490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 10 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] As a result of political changes in our country, religious leaders have started to take an active part in public life. Representatives of Saudi Arabia's clergy arrived in Uzbekistan to further cooperate and expand contacts.

[Sh. Ganiyeva, identified by screen caption] Major religious figures from the Islamic World League have arrived in Tashkent at the invitation of the spiritual administration of the Muslims of Central Asia and Kazakhstan. The aim of this visit is to become acquainted with the life of Muslims of Central Asia and render aid for the construction and restoration of mosques. But in a few days time 500 pilgrims from Uzbekistan will leave Tashkent for the first time for the town of Jeddah to make their pilgrimage to Mecca, the sacred place of the Muslim religion. All of this was discussed at a meeting between his eminence mufti

(Mukhammad Sadyk Mukhammad Yusupov) and Shayk Muhammad ibn Al- Nasir al-Abudi, deputy secretary general of the Islamic World League. Only the development of freedom in all spheres of human life gives extensive opportunities for mutual cooperation. [Al-Abudi is here shown speaking to the camera, his words can be heard in the vernacular, Ganiyeva translates his remarks into Russian]

We are first and foremost interested in cooperation in the sphere of culture which will undoubtedly bring mutually advantageous trade and economic links. And the more understanding there is in the various spheres of human activity, the more prospects there will be for the establishment of friendly relations between our countries. [video shows the visitors touring mosques and taking part in talks with Soviet muslims]